THE

VAIŚESHIKA APHORISMS

OF

KAṆÂDA

WITH COMMENTS FROM THE UPASKÂRA OF ŚAN KARA MIŚRA AND THE VIVRITTI OF JAYA NÂRAYAṆA TARKAPANCHÂNANA,

TRANSLATED BY



ARCHIBALD EDWARD GOUGH, B. A.

LATE SCHOLAR OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, AND BODEN SANSKRIT SCHOLAR, PUSEY AND ELLERTON HEBREW SCHOLAR, KENNICOTT HEBREW SCHOLAR, AND DENYER AND JOHNSON THEOLOGICAL SCHOLAR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD ANGLO SANSKRIT PROFESSOR IN THE GOVERNMENT COLLEGE, BENARES, N W. P.

BENARES
E J LAZARUS & CO.
LONDON TRUBNER & CO.

1873.

PRINTED BY E. J. LAZARUS & CO., AT THE MEDICAL HALL PRESS, BENARES

PREFACE.

The following pages will, it is trusted, facilitate to Sanskrit students the perusal of the original text, and to general readers an estimate, of one of the schools of Indian thought. Such interest as they may claim, will be historical, as a picture of a low stage of metaphysical culture. The system must be judged from its proper place in the history of philosophy; not hastily condemned from a modern point of view. The Indian cosmologies, imperfect in analysis, and hasty in synthesis, may be compared to the pre-Socratic schemes among the Greeks. In India the Socratic reform in method has been wanting, and speculation has lapsed into a fruitless scholasticism. By these systems, however, it is that Indian thinkers are formed, and we may well remember that in mental discipline "*speculation is higher than speculative truth*", *and* that where philosophers "have not realised truth, they have always determined exertion" *

The technical terms employed in translation are necessarily rather suggestive than reproductive of the original. The artificial groupings, or (to use Locke's expression) mixed modes, of European and of Indian thought, intersect and overlap, rather than coincide with, one another. The reader should bear this in mind, that he may avoid the misleading associations of an English terminology.

* See Sir W. Hamilton's Discussions, pp. 40 42.

A brief indication of the conceptions dominant in the Vaiśeshika system, may be useful to the uninitiated. These are the transition of souls from everlasting through new embodiments and new spheres of being; therein reaping in pleasures and pains the fruits of merits and demerits ever reproduced as seed by plant and plant by seed; the atomic aggregates which make up the object world, eternally disintegrated and redintegrated by the efficacy of works, with or without—for it is questioned—the intervention of a creator spirit Thus in bondage to sensuous experience, painful at the best, the soul must wait its release until, the understanding purified by good works, it attains to knowledge of the modes of being. This knowledge disengages the soul from its appetent and active functions, and merges it in the absolute.

English readers will find abundant information, for further guidance, in Colebrooke's Essays on the Religion and Philosophy of the Hindús, the Rev. K. M. Banerjea's Dialogues on Hindú Philosophy, Dr. Fitz-edward Hall's Rational Refutation of Hindú Philosophy translated from the Hindí of the Rev. Nehemiah Nila-kantha, Professor Max Muller's Essay on Indian Logic appended to Abp Thomson's Laws of Thought, and the articles on the Vaiśeshika and other Indian philosophies in Chambers's Encyclopædia. Those who read Sanskrit will find a useful epitome of the Vaiśeshika doctrines in the Tattwa-padártha-sára, the work of an illustrious pandit of the present day, Jaya-náráyana-tarkapanchánana late professor of Hindú Philosophy in the Government Sanskrit College Calcutta, the author of the

Vivritti from which many of the comments in the following pages are reproduced

The translation of the Vaiseshika Aphorisms is reprinted from the 'Pandit,' a monthly publication of the Benares Sanskrit College It was undertaken at the instance of Mr R. T H Griffith, the learned principal of the Benares College, as supplementary, in however imperfect a manner, to the text books of the other Indian systems translated by the late Dr Jas Ballantyne The text followed is that of Dr Roer and Pandit Jaya náráyána tarkapanchanana published in the Bibliotheca Indica

Its re appearance is due to Dr E J Lazarus, proprietor of the Benares Medical Hall Press, to whom Indian literature is already largely indebted for similar encouragement

BENARES COLLEGE,
Jan 3rd 1873





THE VAISESHIKA APHORISMS OF KANADA

FIRST BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

INTRODUCTION[1] All students who wish to shun the multi- ide of pains engendered in this world by birth old age death and ie like, learn from revelation tradition the epics the Puránas and nd other sources, that the means of escaping them is investigation f the real nature of soul. Now, certain disciples who had in the lescribed manner studied the Vedas and their subordinate sciences, unenvious and attentive hearers, in quest of knowledge reverenti- ally approached the great and holy sage Kanáda. The sage full of compassion taught them the system of the ten sections Enuncia- tion, definition, investigation [of the adequacy of definitions],—such is the threefold method of this system. Division is only a particular kind of enunciation, hence there is no addition [to be made] Al- though description of the categories is the chief object of this trea- tise yet from the importance of merit as the instrumental cause of real knowledge of the categories, he in the first place promises a description of that. *Vritti*

अथातो धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Now, then, we will explain [what] merit [is]

---

[1] इह खलु जन्मजरामरणादिजनिततापकलापं जिहासवः सर्व एवान्तेवासिनस्तज्ज्ञाननिदानमात्मतत्त्वदर्शनमाकर्णयन्ति श्रुतिस्मृतीतिहासपुराणादिषु । अथ केचिदन्तेवासिनो विधिवदधीतवेदवेदाङ्गा अनसूयकाः समञ्चक्षणा मननाय भगवन्तं कणादं महर्षिं विधिवदुपसेदुः । ततः परमकारुणिकः स मुनिर्दशाध्यायीतन्त्रं तानुपदिदेश । उद्देशो लक्षणं परीक्षा चेति त्रिविधा ऽस्य शास्त्रस्य प्रवृत्तिः विभागस्तु विशेषोद्देश एवेति नाधिक्यम् । यद्यप्यत्र तन्त्रे पदार्थनिरूपणस्यैव प्राधान्यं तथापि पदार्थतत्त्वज्ञाननिदानतया धर्मस्यैव प्राधान्यात् तन्निरूपणमेव प्रथमं प्रतिजानीते ॥

¹ Now means after being requested by his disci[p] 'Then' since pupils quick in hearing &c, and unenvious hav[e ap]proached Or else the word 'Now' (*atha*) has an ausp[icious] sense Thus it is said 'The syllable *Om* and the word *atha* these two cleft of old the throat of Brahmá and issued forth, there fore both are of happy omen *Upaskara*

Merit defined. यतो ऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Merit is that from which [results] attainment of elevation and of the highest good

² It might be objected that because merit is not productive of any result, a description of it is useless Hence he states its characteristic shewing that to merit belongs the attainment of the highest object of man Exaltation is paradise the highest good is emancipation that cause from which [results] the attainment —production—, of these is merit and therefore it is fitting that merit should be explained inasmuch as by reason of its effecting the highest object of man which consists of paradise and liberation [of the soul] it is to be acquired by those who are desirous of enjoyment and of emancipation. V

³ Exaltation is knowledge of the truth, the highest good is final cessation of pain, that from which both [result] is merit. The highest good is [attained] by means of exaltation. If this be

¹ अथेति शिष्याकाङ्क्षानन्तर्यमाह । अत इति । यत श्रवणादिपटवो ऽनसूयकाश्चान्तेवासिन उपसेदुरित्यर्थ । यद्वा अथशब्दो मङ्गलार्थ । तदुक्तम ।

ओङ्कारश्चाथशब्दश्च द्वावेतौ ब्रह्मण पुरा ।
कण्ठं भित्त्वा विनिर्यातौ तेन माङ्गलिकावुभौ ॥ इति ॥

² ननु धर्मस्याकिञ्चित्करत्वेन तन्निरूपणं व्यर्थम् । धर्मस्य परमपुरुषार्थसाधनत्वं दर्शयन् तल्लक्षणमाह । अभ्युदय स्वर्ग निःश्रेयस मोक्षस्तयो सिद्धिरुत्पत्तिर्यत कारणात स धर्म तथा च स्वर्गापवर्गरूपपरमपुरुषार्थसाधनतया बुभुक्षुणा मुमुक्षुणाञ्चोपादेयत्वाद्धर्मस्य व्याख्यानं युक्तमेव ॥

³ अभ्युदयस्तत्त्वज्ञानं निःश्रेयसमात्यन्तिकी दुःखनिवृत्ति तदुभयं यत स धर्म अभ्युदयद्वारकं निःश्रेयसमिति मध्यपदलोपी समास पञ्चमीतत्पुरुषो वा स च धर्मो निवृत्तिलक्षणो वक्ष्यते यदि तु निदिध्यासनादियोगसाध्यो धर्मो ऽभ्युपगम्य तदा विधिरूप ॥

…e meaning the compound [*abhyudaya nihśreyas*] has an ellipse of central member or is a Tat purusha ablatively dependent, if merit is implied to be characterised by Cessation [of pain], but if merit to be attained by practices such as devout meditation &c and [synonymous with] the result of good actions done in a former state of being, then the compound is regular in form U

Note. Exaltation according to the Upaskára means either knowledge of the truth *(tattva jnána)* or the result of good works done in a former birth *(adrishta)* If it signify knowledge of the truth, the aphorism must be translated, 'That is merit from which [results] the highest good by means of exaltation' If the result of actions done in a former life be intended by exaltation, the aphorism is to be rendered as above

[1] The attainment of paradise by merit is with visible means, while the attainment of liberation is by means of knowledge of the truth, consequently there is a distinction V

[2] He proceeds to remove the doubt, What proof is there of [the existence of] merit and of its being the means of attaining to knowledge of the truth &c If you say the Veda we reply not so, to the authority of that is doubted and accordingly an aphorism of Aksha charana says, That [Veda] is unauthoritative being vitiated by falsity self contradictoriness and repetition V

The Veda authoritative

तद्वचनादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 Authoritativeness belongs to revelation because it is a declaration of that

[3] The word that *(tat)* signifies God though he has not been previously mentioned, it being inferred from his being universally

---

[1] धर्मस्य स्वर्गसाधनता साक्षादेव अपवर्गसाधनता तु तत्त्वज्ञानद्वारेति विशेष ॥

[2] ननु धर्मे तस्य तत्त्वज्ञानादिसाधनत्वे च किं मानं वेद इति मानमिति चेत् न तत्प्रामाण्यस्यापि सन्दिग्धत्वात् तथा चाक्षचरणसूत्रं तदप्रामाण्यमनृतव्याघातपुनरुक्तदोषेभ्य इतीत्याशङ्कां निरस्यति ॥

[3] तदित्यनुपक्रान्तमपि प्रसिद्धिसिद्धतयेश्वरं परामृशति यथा तदप्रामाण्यमनृत

known just as in the aphorism of Gautama 'That is unauthoritative being vitiated by falsity self contradictoriness and repetition by the word 'That the Veda is signified though not previously mentioned Accordingly authoritativeness belongs to revelation—the Veda—because it was declared by him—revealed by God Or else 'That signifies the contiguous [word] merit and accordingly authoritativeness belongs to revelation—the Veda—because it declares—expounds—merit for whatever statement sets forth a matter of certain knowledge is an authority U

' By the word 'That expressive of something already known God is signified, though not previously mentioned And accordingly the sense is that the authoritativeness of the Veda must necessarily be admitted since it was declared by an everlasting all wise and all holy Spirit V

Means of attaining the highest good

धर्मविशेषप्रसूताद् द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्यविशेषसमवायाना पदार्थाना साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्या तत्त्वज्ञानान्नि॰श्रेयसम् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 The highest good [results] from knowledge of the truth which springs from particular merit [and is obtained] by means of the similarity and dissimilarity of the categories substance attribute action generality particularity and inhesion

' Such knowledge of the truth depends upon the Vaiseshika system hence even causation of the highest good belongs to that

व्याघातपुनरुक्तदोषेभ्य इति गौतमीयसूत्रे तच्छब्देनानुपक्रान्तोऽपि वेद परामृश्यते । तथा च तद्वचनात् तेनेश्वरेण प्रणयनादाम्नायस्य वेदस्य प्रामाण्य यद्वा तदिति सन्निहितं धर्ममेव परामृशति तथा च धर्मस्य वचनात् प्रतिपादनात् आम्नायस्य वेदस्य प्रामाण्यं यद्धि वाक्य प्रामाणिकमर्थं प्रतिपादयति तत्प्रमाणमेव यत इत्यर्थ ॥

' ईश्वरस्याप्रक्रान्तत्वेऽपि प्रसिद्धार्थकेन तच्छब्देन परामर्शो भवत्येव तथाच नित्य सर्वज्ञनिर्दोषपुरुषप्रणीतत्वात् वेदस्य प्रामाण्यमवश्यमेवाभ्युपेयमित्यर्थ ॥

' एतादृश तत्त्वज्ञानं वैशेषिकशास्त्राधीनमिति तस्यापि नि श्रेयसहेतुत्व दण्डापूपायितम शास्त्रनि श्रेयसयोर्हेतुहेतुमद्भाव शास्त्रतत्त्वज्ञानयोर्व्यापारव्यापारिभाव नि श्रेयसतत्त्वज्ञानयो कार्यकारणभाव द्रव्यादिपदार्थशास्त्रयो प्रतिपाद्यप्रतिपादकभाव सम्बन्धोऽवगम्यते एतेषाञ्च सम्बन्धाना ज्ञानाच्च श्रेयसार्थिनामिह शास्त्रे प्रवृत्ति । नि श्रेय

[system] Between the system and the highest good the connection of relation of cause to effect between the system and knowledge of the truth the connection of relation of agency to the agent between the highest good and knowledge of the truth the connection of relation of effect to cause between the categories substance &c and the system the connection of relation of matter expounded to exposition is understood to exist. It is from knowledge of these connections that in this world seekers of the the highest good apply themselves to this system The highest good is final cessation of pain Finality of cessation of pain is non simultaneity with antecedent non existence (potential existence) of pain in the common substratum or simultaneity with subsequent non-existence (destruction) of all particular qualities of soul which are produced at the same time and have a common substratum Or emancipation [of the soul] is potential existence of pain terminated by cessation of all particular qualities [*of the soul*] *In the* second aphorism of Gautama it is stated that on the successive removal of pain birth activity faults [i e desires and aversions] and false *knowledge and* on their consequent non existence *emancipation* ensues Here the argument from non existence of cause to non existence of effect proves emancipation to be characterised by antecedent non existence of pain for with respect to the removal of activity consequent upon the removal of vice the removal of birth on the removal of activity and the removal of pain on the removal of birth such removal is not subsequent non existence but non production,

---

समात्यन्तिकी दुःखनिवृत्तिः । दुःखनिवृत्तेश्चात्यन्तिकत्वं समानाधिकरणदुःखप्रागभावासमानकालीनत्वं युगपदुत्पन्नसमानाधिकरणसर्वात्मविशेषगुणध्वंससमानकालीनत्वं वा । अशेषविशेषगुणध्वंसावधिकदुःखप्रागभावो वा मुक्तिः । गौतमीयद्वितीयसूत्रे दुःखजन्मप्रवृत्तिदोषमिथ्याज्ञानानामुत्तरोत्तरापाये तदनन्तराभावादपवर्ग इत्यत्र कारणाभावात् कार्याभावाभिधानं दुःखप्रागभावरूपामेव मुक्तिं द्रढयति नहि दोषापाये प्रवृत्त्यपायः प्रवृत्त्यपाये जन्मापायः जन्मापाये दुःखापाय इत्यपायो ध्वंसः किन्त्वनुत्पत्तिः सा च प्रागभाव एव । धर्मविशेषप्रसूतादिति तत्त्वज्ञानादित्यस्य विशेषणं तत्र धर्मविशेषो निवृत्तिलक्षणो धर्मः यदि तु तत्त्वं ज्ञायतेऽनेनेति तत्त्वज्ञानं शास्त्रमुच्यते तदा धर्मविशेष ईश्वरनियोगप्रसादरूपो वक्तव्यः श्रूयते हीश्वरनियोगप्रसादादवधिगम्य कणादो महर्षिः शास्त्रं प्रणीतवानिति ॥

and non production is antecedent non-existence 'From knowledge of the truth which springs from particular merit —such is the special character of that [knowledge] and accordingly particular merit is merit differentiated by finality but if by knowledge of the truth the [Vaiśeshika] system be intended (the truth being known by means of that system) then particular merit must be explained as characterised by the ordinance and grace of God for it is a tradition that the great saint Kaṇâda revealed the system in consequence of having obtained the ordinance and grace of God U

¹ Particular merit is particular good works done either in this life or in a former state of existence By special good works knowledge of the truth is produced by means of the similarity and dissimilarity of substance and the other categories Next meditation on the soul is produced, next by means of meditation a [mental] presentation of the soul is produced, and after that by means of destruction of false knowledge &c emancipation ensues In this place there is mention of six categories spoken of as existing but in reality non existence is also implied by the sage as another category Accordingly there is no discrepancy in such aphorisms as the following in the second daily lesson 'From non existence of cause is non-existence of effect, and in the ninth book ['An effect has no antecedent existence] because of the non existence of ascription to it of actions and attributes V

Division of substance

पृथिव्यापस्तेजो वायुराकाश कालो दिगात्मा मन इति द्रव्याणि ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Earth water light air, ether, time space soul and the internal organ —are the substances

---

¹ धर्मविशेष ऐहिको जन्मान्तरीयो वा सुकृतविशेष । सुकृतविशेषेण द्रव्यादिपदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां तत्त्वज्ञानं जायते तत आत्ममननं अनन्तरं निदिध्यासनेनात्मसाक्षात्कारो जायते तदनन्तरं मिथ्याज्ञानादिनाशक्रमेण मोक्षो भवतीत्यर्थं । अत्र षट्पदार्थकीर्तनं भावाभिप्रायेण वस्तुतः ऽभावो ऽपि पदार्थान्तरतया मुनेरभिप्रेत । अत एव द्वितीयाह्निके कारणाभावात् कार्याभाव इति सूत्रस्य नवमाध्याये क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावात् इत्यादि सूत्राणाञ्च नासङ्गति ॥

[1] The particle *iti* is expressive of limitation therefore the the meaning is that there are nine substances, neither more nor less If it be objected What is the use of the particular *iti* when the exclusion of a lesser or greater number [of substances] is effected by the mere force of the division? this is to be determined, that it is because the particle *iti* is employed to indicate the logical subject in the construction of the aphorism and only in order to elucidate the purport of the division since gold &c, and God are included in this [enumeration] and since it is explained [in V 2 19] that darkness suspected [by some] of being additional, is a non existence The construction without the use of compound words is to shew the importance of all [the substances], and the author of the aphorisms himself will point out their definitions when treating of their dissimilarities U

Note—*Cp* the Muktávali on Bháshá parichchheda 3 [2] If it be objected There is a tenth substance darkness why is it not enumerated? for it is cognised by preception and substantiality belongs to it because it is possessed of colour and action and because devoid of odour it is not earth and because it possesses dark colour it is not water &c and the eye deprived of light is the organ [used] in perceiving it We reply that it is not so, because it is illogical to imagine another substance when it is necessarily produced by non existence of light The notion that

---

[1] इतिकारोऽवधारणार्थं तेन नवैव द्रव्याणि नाधिकानि न न्यूनानीत्यर्थः । ननु विभागबलादेव न्यूनाधिकसङ्ख्याव्यवच्छेदसिद्धौ किमितिकारेणेति चेत् उद्देशमात्रपरतया ऽपि सूत्रसम्भवे विभागतात्पर्यस्फोरणार्थमेवेतिकाराभिधानात् सुवर्णादीनामीश्वरस्य चात्रैवान्तर्भावात् अन्धकारस्य चाधिकत्वेनाशङ्क्यमानस्याभावत्वस्योत्पादनादेतदध्यवसेयम । असमासकरणं तु सर्वेषां प्राधान्यप्रदर्शनाय लक्षणमेतेषां तु वैधर्म्यावसरे सूत्रकृदेव दर्शयिष्यति ॥

[2] ननु दशमं द्रव्यं तमः कुतो नोक्तं । तद्धि प्रत्यक्षेण गृह्यते । तस्य च रूपवत्त्वात् कर्मवत्त्वाच्च द्रव्यत्वम । तच्च गन्धशून्यत्वात न पृथिवी । नीलरूपवत्त्वाच्च न जलादिकम । तत्प्रत्यक्षे चालोकनिरपेक्षं चक्षुः कारणमिति चेत् । न । आवश्यकतेजोऽभावेनोपपत्तौ द्रव्यान्तरकल्पनाया अन्याय्यत्वात । रूपवत्ताप्रतीतिस्तु भ्रमरूपा । कर्मवत्त्वप्रतीतिरपि आलोकापसारणोपाधिकी भ्रान्तिरेव । स्वर्णस्य यथा तैजसत्वमभावस्तथा दृश्यते ॥

it is possessed of colour is erroneous The notion that it possesses action is also an error occasioned by the departure of light It will be declared how it is that gold is included in light

Darkness was affirmed to be a *substance by the Sánkhyas*, gold by the Mimánsakas

[1] The construction without the use of compound words is designed to shew that all the substances independently of one another produce particular effects or is intended to teach that they all equally produce effects *which inhere in them* Among these nine divisions of substance ether time and space do not form any class since they have only a single existence but the rest form classes V

Qualities enumerated

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शाः सङ्ख्याः परिमाणानि पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभागौ परत्वापरत्वे बुद्धयः सुखदुःखे इच्छाद्वेषौ प्रयत्नाश्च गुणाः[2] ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Colour taste smell and touch, numbers extensions individuality conjunction and disjunction priority and posteriority, intellections pleasure and pain desire and aversion and *volitions are qualities*

[2] By the particle *cha* he implies in addition to these gravity, fluidity, viscidity self restitution merit demerit and sound,

---

[1] असमासकरणं तु सर्वेषामितरनिरपेक्षेण कार्यविशेषोत्पादकताप्रदर्शनार्थं स्वसमवेतकार्यजनने सर्वेषां तुल्यताज्ञापनार्थं वा । अत्र नवसु द्रव्यविभाजकेषु गगनत्वकालत्वदिक्त्वानामेकैकमात्रवृत्तित्वाच्च जातित्वं शेषाणां पुनर् जातित्वमेवेति ॥

[2] चकारेण गुरुत्वद्रवत्वस्नेहसंस्कारधर्माधर्मशब्दान् समुच्चिनोति ते हि प्रसिद्धगुणभावा इति कण्ठतो नोक्ताः । *गुणत्वञ्चामीषां यथास्थानं लक्षणतः* स्वरूपतश्च वक्ष्यति रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शानां समानकालीनरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शसामानाधिकरण्यं नास्तीति सूचनार्थं समासः संख्यापरिमाणयोस्तु समानकालीनसंख्यापरिमाणसामानाधिकरण्यसूचनाय समासो बहुवचननिर्देशश्च यद्यप्येकत्वसमानाधिकरणं नैकत्वान्तरं न वा महत्त्वदीर्घत्वसमानाधिकरणं महत्त्वदीर्घत्वान्तरं तथापि द्वित्वादीनामन्योन्यं सामानाधिकरण्ये महत्त्वदीर्घत्वादीनाञ्च विजातीयपरिमाणयोः सामानाधिकरण्यमस्त्येव । पृथक्त्वञ्च यद्यपि द्विपृथक्त्वादिसमानाधिकरणं तेन संख्यावद्बहुत्वेनैव निर्देष्टुमर्हति तथाप्यवधिसापेक्षत्वलक्षणसंख्यातो वैधर्म्यं सूचयितुमेकवचननिर्देशः । संयोगविभागयोर्द्वयोरप्येककर्मजन्यत्वसूचनाय

for those being well known to be qualities are not expressly mentioned He will explain in the proper place from their characteristic and from their form that these are qualities The compound 'colour taste, smell, and touch,' is intended to point out that there is no common substratum of synchronous colours, tastes, smells, and touches Numbers and extensions are not made a compound word and are named in the plural number, the design being to indicate that contemporaneous numbers and extensions have a common substratum Although the common substratum of unity is not another unity and the common substratum of greatness and length, is not another greatness and length yet duality &c are the common substratum of each other and in greatness, length &c, is a common substratum for two heterogeneous extensions Although individuality is the common substratum for the individuality of two &c and should accordingly be specified in the plural like numbers yet the singular is employed to indicate its difference from numbers on account of its being characterised by the implying of limitation Conjunction and disjunction are expressed by [one word in] the dual to indicate that though two, they are produced by one action [or motion] Priority and posteriority are expressed in the dual to imply that they are relative *to one another and to imply that they are indifferently properties* of space and time The plural intellections is intended to expel the doctrine of the Sankhyas that intellection is one

---

द्विवचनं परत्वापरत्वयोरन्योन्याश्रयनिरूप्यतया दिक्काललिङ्गत्वाविशेषसूचनाय च द्विवचनं बुद्धीनां विद्यादिभेदेन साङ्ख्याभिमतैकमात्रबुद्धिनिराकरणसूचनाय बहुवचनं सुखदुःखयोर्द्वयोरपि भोगत्वावच्छेदेनैककार्यजनकत्वमविशेषेण चादृष्टात्मकत्वं सुखस्यापि दुःखेनापि भोगजनकत्वं ख्यापयितुं द्विवचनं इच्छाद्वेषयोर्द्वयोरपि प्रवृत्तिं प्रति कारणत्वसूचनाय द्विवचनं प्रयत्नानां विहितनिषिद्धगोचराणां दशविधानां पुण्यहेतुत्वं दशविधानाञ्च पापहेतुत्वमभिसन्धाय बहुवचनमित्युह्येयम्। यद्वा रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शानां भौतिकेन्द्रियव्यवस्थाहेतुत्वज्ञापनार्थं पाकजप्रक्रियाव्यवस्थापनार्थं वा ते समस्योक्ताः संख्यायां द्वित्वबहुत्वादौ विप्रतिपत्तिरिति तन्निराकरणसूचनार्थं बहुत्वेनाभिधानं पृथक्त्वे तु संख्याबहुत्वेनैवास्यापि बहुत्वमिति सूचनाय विधिज्ञानव्यञ्जनीयत्वं संख्यातो वैधर्म्यमिति सूचनायच पृथगभिधानं परिमाणे तु दीर्घत्वह्रस्वत्वादिविप्रतिपत्तिनिरासाय बहुवचनं संयोगविभागयोरन्योन्यविरोधज्ञापनाय द्विवचनं ॥

only on the *grounds* of their division into knowledge &c The dual term pleasure and pain is used to establish [the doctrine] that they, though two produce one effect to be distinguished as fruition that they *indifferently bring to pass the* consequences of actions done in a *former state and that even pleasure must* be accounted pain Desire and aversion are in the dual to indicate that both are causes of activity The plural form of volitions implies that they are the cause of merit from ten kinds of lawful and prohibited objects and the cause of sin from ten kinds of objects. Or else colour taste smell, and touch are *mentioned in a compound word to teach that they* are the cause of the relation between the elements and the organs of sense or else to establish the effects which are produced by heat There is a contrariety in number which consists of duality plurality &c. —it is to imply the denial of this that [number] is mentioned in the plural Individuality is enumerated separately to denote that it is manifold by reason of the plurality of numbers, and to imply that its difference from number *consists in* revealing the knowledge of a limit In the case of extension the plural *is* used *to deny that there is any contrariety* between length breadth &c *Conjunction and disjunction are* in the dual to denote their mutual opposition U

Enumeration of actions

उत्क्षेपणमवक्षेपणमाकुञ्चनं प्रसारणं गमनमिति कर्माणि ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Throwing upwards throwing downwards contracting expanding and going are the actions.

[1] Actions by reason of their production by substances and by qualities and from their inhesion in substances possessed of colour *are* known by perception. Accordingly after the enumeration of substances and qualities [Kanáda] declared the enunciation and division *of actions.* U

---

[1] कर्मणां द्रव्यजन्यतया गुणजन्यतया च रूपवद्द्रव्यसमवायाच्च प्रत्यक्षतेति द्रव्यगुणाभिधानानन्तरं कर्मोद्देशविभागावाह ॥

[1] *Iti* as before expresses limitation Action as a class is cognised by perception so also are throwing upwards &c according to the author of the Muktávali Going is a particular class comprising revolution evacuation dropping flaming upwards bending up and down &c V

Common element in substance quality and action

सदनित्यं द्रव्यवत् कार्यं कारणं सामान्यविशेषवदि-
ति द्रव्यगुणकर्मणामविशेषः ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Existence transitoriness inhesion in substance effect cause and possession of generality and particularity are the common element of substances qualities and actions

[2] After *iti* the word *pratyaya* is to be supplied The general is existence the particular is substantiality The notion existence &c is applicable to quality and action as well as to substance in this there is no particularity Therefore existence opposition to subsequent non existence [or to destruction] the possession of substance as a coinherent [or material] cause opposition to antecedent non existence causality and the constituting of a class contained under existence is that which is *similar* in substances qualities and actions Although transitoriness inhesion in substance effect and cause are not comprehended in an eternal substance or quality or causality in an atom yet it is here meant that transitoriness is a condition of such members of the categories as

[1] इति पूर्ववदवधारणपरः । कर्मत्वजातिः प्रत्यक्षसिद्धा एवमुत्क्षेपणत्वादिकमपीति मुक्तावलीकारः । गमनत्वञ्च जातिविशेषो भ्रमणरेचनस्यन्दनोर्द्ध्वज्वलननमनोन्नमनादि व्यापि ॥

[2] इतीत्यनन्तरं प्रत्यय इत्यध्याहार्य्यं सामान्यं तद्विशेषो द्रव्यत्वादि तद्वत् । सदित्यादिप्रत्ययो यथा द्रव्ये तथा गुणकर्म्मणोरपि तत्र न कश्चिद्विशेषः । तथा च सत्तावत्त्वं ध्वंसप्रतियोगित्वं द्रव्यसमवायिकारणत्वं प्रागभावप्रतियोगित्वं कारणत्वं सत्ताव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वञ्च द्रव्यगुणकर्म्मणां साधर्म्यमिति भावः । यद्यप्यनित्यत्वादित्रिकं नित्ये द्रव्ये गुणे चाव्याप्तं कारणत्वञ्च पारिमाण्डल्यादौ तथापि ध्वंसप्रतियोगिभाववृत्तिपदार्थविभाजकोपाधिमत्त्वं द्रव्यत्वस्य प्रागभावप्रतियोगिभाववृत्तिपदार्थविभाजकोपाधिमत्त्वं कार्यत्वं समवाय्यसमवाय्यन्यतरकारणवृत्तिपदार्थविभाजकोपाधिमत्त्वं कारणत्वं द्रव्यादीनां साधर्म्यमित्यत्र तात्पर्य्यम् ॥

exist in virtue of a being opposed to subsequent non existence inhesion in substance is a condition of such members of the categories as exist in virtue of substance as *their coinherent cause*, the being an effect is a condition of such members of the categories as exist in virtue of a being opposed to antecedent non existence, and causality *is a condition of* such members of the categories as exist as coinherent or non coinherent causes V

Common element in substances and qualities

द्रव्यगुणयोः सजातीयारम्भकत्वं साधर्म्यम् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 The common property of substance and quality is that they originate things of the same class

[1] Terrene atoms originate a terrene aggregate of two atoms blue colour and the like in an atom produce blue colour and the like in an aggregate of two atoms Such is the origination by substance and quality *of things of the same class* Although this cannot be predicated of ether &c and *of simple substances* and of the qualities of the e yet the meaning is that there is a similarity in the conditions of the divisions of the categories existing by reason of the origination of homogeneous things V

Cp Muktavali on Bhāshā parichchheda 14 [2] That which is of atomic dimension is not the cause of anything for that would originate an extension in substance originated by its own substratum [the atom] But this is impossible for one extension is productive *of another extension exceeding* that which belongs to things of its own class as *from a great thing a greater* is originated and so consequently that which would be pro

---

[1] पार्थिवाः परमाणवः पार्थिवद्व्यणुकमारभन्ते परमाणुनीलरूपादिकञ्च द्व्यणुकादिगते नीलरूपादिकमारभत इति द्रव्यगुणयोः सजातीयारम्भकत्वं यद्यपि गगनादावन्त्यावयविनि तद्गुणे चाव्याप्तिस्तथापि सजातीयारम्भकवृत्तिपदार्थविभाजकोपाधिमत्त्वस्य साधर्म्यत्वे तात्पर्यम् ॥

[2] अणुपरिमाणं न तु कस्यापि कारणम्। तद्धि स्वाश्रयारब्धद्रव्यपरिमाणारम्भकं भवेत्। तच्च न सम्भवति। परिमाणस्य स्वसमानजातीयोत्कृष्टपरिमाणजनकत्वात्। महदारब्धस्य महत्तरत्ववत्। अणुजन्यस्याणुतरत्वप्रसङ्गाच्च। एवं परममहत्परिमाणमतीन्द्रियसामान्य विशेषाश्चेति बोध्यम् ॥

duced from an atom would be smaller than an atom The same is to be understood to be the case with respect to infinitely great extension, and generality transcending sense, and particularity

Explanation of the foregoing aphorism

द्रव्याणि द्रव्यान्तरमारभन्ते गुणाश्च गुणान्तरम् ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 Substances originate another substance, and qualities another quality

[1] He elucidates what was said before The sense is obvious V

Actions do not originate actions.

कर्म कर्मसाध्यं न विद्यते ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 An action cannot be effected by an action

[2] The meaning is that there is no proof that one action can be effected by another, as there is that substances and qualities are originated by things of the same class It is here intended to be said that if one action produced another, it would produce it after being itself produced, as in the case of sound Now, as the former action produced a disjunction from conjunct substances, from what would the second action produce a disjunction? For disjunction is preceded by conjunction and there is not another conjunction produced in the same substratum, but if [by the subsequent action] there is no production of disjunction, the definition of action is violated U

The characteristic of action is that it is the immediate cause of conjunction and disjunction

Difference of substances, qualities, and actions

न द्रव्यं कार्यं कारणञ्च बधति ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 A substance is not destroyed either by its effect or by its cause

---

[1] पूर्वोक्तमेव स्पष्टयति । सुगमम् ॥

[2] सजातीयारब्धद्रव्यगुणयोरिव कर्मसाध्ये कर्मणि प्रमाणं नास्तीत्यर्थः । इदमत्राकूतम् । कर्म यदि कर्म जनयेत स्वोत्पत्त्यनन्तरमेव जनयेत शब्दवत् । तथा च पूर्वकर्मणैव यावत् संयोगिद्रव्येभ्यो विभागे जनिते द्वितीयं कर्म येन सह विभागं जनयेत विभागस्य संयोगपूर्वकत्वात् संयोगान्तरस्य च तत्राधिकरणे ऽनुत्पन्नत्वात् विभागाजनने तु कर्म लक्षणहते ॥

[1] The meaning is that between two substances which have entered into the relation of effect and cause there is not the relation of destroyer and destroyed, inasmuch as the destruction of a substance is due to the destruction of its substratum, and the destruction of its originative conjunction. U.

Continued उभयथा गुणाः ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Qualities [are destroyed] in both [the above] manners

[2] [Qualities] are destroyed by their effects, and are destroyed by their causes First sounds &c, [in a series] are destroyed by their effects, but the last is destroyed by its cause, for the last sound but one destroys the last U

Continued कार्यविरोधि कर्म ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 An action is opposed to its effect

[3] He declares that an action is destroyed by its own effect The sense is that an action is subject to opposition, i e destruction, wrought by its effect which consists of a subsequent conjunction V

Characteristic of substance क्रियागुणवत् समवायिकारणमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 The definition of *substance is that it is possessed of actions and qualities and is a coinherent cause.*

[4] 'Possessed of actions and qualities because actions and qualities exist in it In this place the word characteristic *(lak-*

---

[1] कार्यकारणभावापन्नयोर्द्रव्ययोर्वध्यघातकभावो नास्तीत्यर्थः। आश्रयनाशारम्भकसंयोगनाशाभ्यामेव द्रव्यनाशादिति भावः ॥

[2] कार्यवध्याः कारणवध्याश्चेत्यर्थः । आद्यशब्दादीनां कार्यवध्यत्वं चरमस्य तु कारणवध्यत्वमुपान्त्येन शब्देन अन्त्यस्य नाशात् ॥

[3] स्वकार्यमेव कर्मणो नाशकमित्याह । कार्येणोत्तरसंयोगरूपेण कृतो यो विरोधो नाशस्तद्वत् कर्मेत्यर्थः ॥

[4] क्रियाश्च गुणाश्च विद्यन्ते ऽस्मिन्निति क्रियागुणवत् अत्र लक्षणशब्दश्चिन्हवचनः सामानासमानजातीयव्यवच्छेदकव्यतिरेकिलिङ्गविशेषवचनश्च लक्ष्यते ऽनेनेति व्युत्पत्ति

shand) denotes a sign and a particular distinctive property excluding objects of the same and of different classes according to the force of the etymology, It is discerned *(lakshyate)* by means of this Accordingly by means of action it is discerned that such and such a thing is a substance and by the possession of qualities substance is discerned as excluded from things of the same and of different classes. The five categories quality &c, [quality, action generality, particularity, and inhesion] belong to the same class by reason of the notion of existence, while non-existence is of a different class. Substance, then is different from quality &c, because it possesses qualities That which is not different from quality &c does not possess qualities as quality &c. And although there is not possession of qualities in a compound substance during its first moment yet opposition to absolute non-existence of qualities is meant to be stated for absolute non existence of qualities is opposed also to antecedent and subsequent non existence of qualities In like manner the being a coinherent cause is a characteristic of the category substance distinguishing it from the [other] six categories U

Characteristic of quality

द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान् संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इति गुणलक्षणम् ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 That it has substance as a substratum that it is without qualities and that it is not a cause of conjunctions and disjunctions being unconcerned with them is the definition of quality

[1] Having substance as a substratum becauseats character

बलात् तत्र क्रियया कर्मणा द्रव्यमिदमिति लक्ष्यते गुणवत्त्वेन च समानासमानजातीयेभ्यो व्यावृत्तं द्रव्यं लक्ष्यते तत्र समानजातीया भावत्वेन गुणादयः पञ्च असमानजातीयस्त्वभावः तेन द्रव्यं गुणादिभ्यो भिन्नं गुणवत्त्वात् यन्न गुणादिभ्यो भिद्यते तन्न गुणवत् यथा गुणादीति । गुणवत्त्वं यद्यप्याद्यक्षणे त्ववयविनि नास्ति तथापि गुणात्यन्ताभावविरोधित्वं विवक्षितं गुणप्रागभावप्रध्वंसयोरपि गुणात्यन्ताभावविरोधित्वात् एवं समवायिकारणत्वमपि षट्पदार्थभेदकमेव द्रव्यपदार्थस्य लक्षणम् ॥

[1] द्रव्यमाश्रयितुं शीलमस्येति द्रव्याश्रयी एतच्च द्रव्येऽपि गतमत आह अगुणवानिति तथापि कर्मण्यतिव्याप्तिरित्यत आह संयोगविभागेष्वकारणम् ॥

is to inhere in substance But this would apply to substances also, accordingly it is *said to be without qualities* But this is predicable also of action therefore it is stated not to be a cause of conjunctions and disjunctions U

Characteristic of action. एकद्रव्यमगुणं संयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षकारणमिति कर्मलक्षणम् ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 That it abides in one substance is without qualities and is the absolute cause of conjunctions and disjunctions is the definition of action.

[1] That which has one substance for its substratum abides in one substance No action has more than one substratum as compound substances and conjunctions and other qualities have more than one substratum V

Similarity of the first three categories द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां द्रव्यं कारणं सामान्यम् ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 Substance is the common cause of substance quality, and actions.

[2] The meaning is that substance quality and action exist in one substance as their coinherent cause. A common property of the three is their forming a class existing in substance as a coinherent cause U

Continued. तथा गुणः ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 Likewise quality (is the common cause of substances, qualities and actions)

[3] A common property of the three is their forming a class existing in quality as a non-coinherent cause. Of substances the non-coinherent cause is conjunction Of qualities which are effects

---

[1] एकं द्रव्यमाश्रयो यस्य तदेकद्रव्यं संयोगादिगुणाश्चानेकाश्रिताः तथा किमपि कर्म नानेकाश्रितम् ॥

[2] एकस्मिन्नेव द्रव्ये समवायिकारणे द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि वर्तन्त इत्ययं द्रव्यसमवायिकारणकवृत्तिजातिमत्त्वं त्रयाणां साधर्म्यम् ॥

[3] गुणासमवायिकारणकवृत्तिजातिमत्त्वं त्रितयसाधर्म्यं द्रव्याणां संयोगः असमवायि

such as colour taste smell touch number, extension individuality &c the non inherent cause is homogeneous causative qualities Of the qualities of the soul such as intellections &c. the non inherent cause is conjunction with the internal organ The non coinherent cause of the qualities of terrene atoms is conjunction with fire The non-coinherent cause of actions is slight contact with fire, a blow, gravity, fluidity self restitution conjunction with soul influenced by actions done in a former state conjunction with soul exerting volition &c Sometimes even a single quality originates the three substance quality and action as for instance, conjunction with a ball of cotton possessed of impetus produces action [i e motion] in another ball of cotton and originates a *substance consisting of an aggregate of two balls of* cotton and the *extension of that aggregate* Sometimes a *single* quality originates a substance and a *quality* e g conjunction which may be described as aggregation independent of impetus with a ball of cotton originates a substance consisting of an aggregate of two balls of cotton and the extension of that substance. U

Effects of action संयोगविभागवेगानां कर्म समानम् ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 Action is the common [cause] of conjunctions disjunctions and impetus

[1] *The action [motion] which is produced in a bow &c produces disjunction of the arrow from the bow and conjunction* elsewhere, and impetus in the arrow V

कारण कार्यगुणाना रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शसख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वादीना सजातीयकारणगुणासमवायिकारणकत्व बुद्ध्यादीनामात्मगुणाना मन सयोगासमवायिकारणकत्व पार्थिवपरमाणुगुणानामग्निसयोगासमवायिकारणकत्व कर्मणा तु यत्नादिनोदनाभिघातगुरुत्वद्रवत्वसस्कारादृष्टवदात्मसयोगप्रयत्नवदात्मसयोगाद्यसमवायिकारणकत्व यथायथ स्वयमूहनीयम् । क्वचिदेकस्यापि गुणस्य त्रयाणा द्रव्यगुणकर्मणामारम्भकत्व तद्यथा वेगवत्तूलपिण्डसयोगस्तूलपिण्डान्तरे कर्म करोति द्वितूलकञ्च द्रव्यमारभते तत्परिमाणञ्च । क्वचिदेको गुणो द्रव्यगुणावारभते यथा तूलपिण्डसयोग एव वेगानपेक्षप्रचयाख्यो द्वितूलक द्रव्य तत्परिमाणञ्चारभते ॥

[1] व्यतिरेकात द्रव्योत्पत्तिसमये कर्मणो ऽभावात् यत कर्मावयवारम्भकसयोग जन

Dissimilarity between action and substance

न द्रव्याणां कर्म ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 Action is not [a cause] of substances.

Continued

व्यतिरेकात् ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 Because it is excluded [from them]

[1] Because it is—excluded—because of the non existence of action at the time of the production of substance. The action which produces an originative conjunction of constituent parts is destroyed at the time of the production of the substance [constituted by those parts] subsequent to conjunction for conjunction is destructive to disjunction Nor can it be maintained that action though non existent at the time of its effect from having existed the previous moment is the cause [of the substance so constituted] For after the destruction of a large piece of cloth there is non existence of action in the constituent parts at the moment previous to the production of fragments of cloth In reality action is not the cause even of a substance depending on an originative conjunction produced by action for it is to be considered that [the substance] is produced otherwise [viz] by conjunction V

Continued

द्रव्याणां द्रव्यं कार्यं सामान्यम् ॥ २३ ॥

Aph. 23 Substance is the common effect of substances

यति संयोगस्य सघायकत्वेन संयोगोत्तरं द्रव्योत्पत्तिकाले तस्य नाशात् न च कर्मणः कालान्तरसत्त्वे ऽपि स्वपूर्वक्षणवृत्तित्वात् कारणत्वं निराबाधमिति वाच्यं महापटनाशानन्तरं खण्डपटोत्पत्तेः पूर्वक्षणे ऽपि तदवयवेषु कर्मणो ऽभावात् वस्तुतः कर्मजनितसंयोगाधीनद्रव्ये ऽपि न कर्म कारणं संयोगान्यथासिद्धत्वादिति ध्येयम् ॥

[1] बहूनामेकस्यारम्भकत्वमुक्त्वा इदानीमेकस्मिन् कार्ये बहूनामारम्भकत्वमाह । द्रव्यं च द्रव्याणि चेति द्रव्याणि तेषां द्रव्याणां । तत्र द्वाभ्यां तन्तुभ्यां द्वितन्तुकः पटो बहुभिरपि तन्तुभिरेकः पट आरभ्यते । नन्वेकतन्तुको ऽपि पटो दृश्यते यत्रैकेनैव तन्तुना आतानवितानवान् भवति इति चेन्न तत्रैकस्य संयोगाभावेनासमवायिकारणाभावात् पटानुत्पत्तेः ॥

'Having stated that many things may originate one, [Kaṇáda] now declares that one product may be originated by many Of substances, i e of two or more substances Thus by two threads a piece of cloth consisting of two threads and similarly by many threads one piece of cloth is originated If it be objected that cloth may be seen which is made of one thread, in which the woof and the warp are made of one and the same thread we reply that it is not so, for there can be no cloth produced in this case there being no non coinherent cause, for there can be no conjunction of a single object U

Continued **गुणवैधर्म्यान्न कर्मणा कर्म ॥ २४ ॥**

Aph 24 Action because of its dissimilarity from quality is *not [an effect] of actions*

[1] It has been stated that the similarity between substance and quality is that they originate things of the same class Also *this has been denied of actions in the aphorism An action is not* effected by another action' This is here repeated U

द्वित्वप्रभृतयः सङ्ख्याः पृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागाश्च ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 Numbers from duality upwards individuality conjunction and disjunction [are originated by more than one substance]

[2] He states that certain qualities also are originated by more than one substance Here the word individuality means the *individuality of two or more objects Accordingly the sense is that* numbers from duality to the highest individuality of two of more objects conjunctions and disjunctions are originated by more than one substance V

---

[1] द्रव्यगुणयो सजातीयारम्भकत्व साधर्म्यमुक्त तत्र कर्म कर्मसाध्यं न विद्यते इति सूत्रे कर्मणा कर्मजनकत्व प्रतिषिद्धमेव तदिहानूद्यते इति भाव ॥

[2] केषाञ्चित् गुणानामप्यनेकद्रव्यारब्धत्वमित्याह। अत्र पृथक्त्वपद द्विपृथक्त्वादिपर तथा च द्वित्वादिपरार्द्धपर्यन्ता सङ्ख्या द्विपृथक्त्वादीनि संयोगविभागाश्च अनेकद्रव्यारब्धा इत्यर्थं ॥

असमवायात् सामान्यकार्यं कर्म न विद्यते ॥ २६ ॥

Aph. 26 Action is not the common effect [of several substances] because it does not inhere [in more than one substance.]

[1] Action is not a common effect originated by more than one, because it does not inhere in two or more It is established by experience that action is different in different substances

संयोगानां द्रव्यम् ॥ २७ ॥

Aph 27. *Substance is the effect of conjunctions.*

[2] One substance consisting of a piece of cloth &c, is the effect of many conjunctions of threads &c U.

[3] This is to be understood with the exception of the conjunctions of impalpable substances, of those of final wholes, and of those of heterogeneous substances. V.

रूपाणां रूपम् ॥ २८ ॥

Aph. 28. A colour is the effect of colours (more than one)

[4] The word colour in both places implies also taste, smell, touch, viscidity, intrinsic fluidity, unity, individuality of units, extension, velocity, elasticity and gravity. One colour &c, then, as a complex whole is produced by many colours &c, having become its coinherent cause V.

गुरुत्वप्रयत्नसंयोगानामुत्क्षेपणम् ॥ २९ ॥

Aph 29 Throwing upwards (is the effect) of gravity, volition, and conjunction.

---

[1] असमवायात् द्वयोर्बहुषु च समवायेन कर्मणो ऽभावात् सामान्यकार्यम् अनेकारब्धं कर्म न विद्यते नास्तीत्यर्थः तथा च प्रतिद्रव्यं भिन्नं भिन्नं कर्म अनुभवसिद्धम् ॥

[2] बहूनां तन्त्वादिसंयोगानां पटादिरूपमेकं द्रव्यं कार्यमित्यर्थः ॥

[3] निःस्पर्शानां द्रव्याणाम् अन्त्यावयविनां विजातीयद्रव्याणाञ्च ये संयोगास्तान् विहायेति द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

[4] रूपपदे रसगन्धस्पर्शस्नेहसांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वैकत्वैकपृथक्त्वपरिमाणवेगस्थितिस्थापक-गुरुत्वानामप्युपलक्षके तथा च समवायिकारणगतैर्बहुभी रूपादिभिरवयविगतमेकं जायते इत्यर्थः ॥

[1] Here gravity existing in the hand a clod of earth &c is the instrumental cause, conjunction with soul possessing volitions is the non coinherent cause of the throwing upwards of the hand, the throwing out of the hand is the non-coinherent cause of the throwing upwards of the clod Here also the term *throwing upwards* is applicable to throwing downwards &c U

[2] Gravity in that which is to be thrown upwards volition in the thrower and expulsion of the thrown from the hand —these are the three causes of throwing upwards Hence in the case of action also the existence of more than one cause must be *admitted* V

संयोगविभागाश्च कर्मणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

Aph 30 Conjunctions and disjunctions (are the effects) of actions

[3] It might be asked By means of what property is there an inference of supersensual objects such as the courses of the sun the moon &c as there is in inference of fire and other causes from smoke and other effects for an action has no effects? He therefore recalls to mind the previously mentioned effects of actions The word and implies in addition to conjunctions and disjunctions impetus and elasticity V

कारणसामान्ये द्रव्यकर्मणां कर्माकारणमुक्तम् ॥ ३१ ॥

Aph 31 In (*treating of*) causes in general action is said not be a cause of substances and actions

---

[1] अत्र गुरुत्वस्य हस्तलोष्टादिवर्त्तिनो निमित्तकारणत्वं प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगस्य समवायिकारणत्वं हस्तनिष्ठोत्क्षेपणस्य तु हस्तनोदनमसमवायिकारणम् अत्राप्युत्क्षेपणपदमवक्षेपणादावपि लाक्षणिकम् ॥

[2] उत्क्षेप्यस्य गुरुत्वम् उत्क्षेप्तुः प्रयत्नः उत्क्षेप्यहस्तनोदनञ्च एते त्रय एवोत्क्षेपणहेतवः अतः कर्मण्यप्यनेककारणकत्वं निराबाधमिति भावः ॥

[3] ननु यथा धूमादिकार्येण वह्न्यादिकारणानामनुमानं तथा अतीन्द्रियकर्मणां सूर्यादिगतीनां केन लिङ्गेनानुमानं कर्मणः कार्याभावादित्यत पूर्वोक्तानि कर्मकार्याणि स्मारयति ॥

[1] By the term 'causes in general,' the section treating thereof is indicated; therefore in the section treating of causes in general the non-causality of action with regard to substance and action is affirmed, but it is not meant that action is in no way a cause so that aphorism, conjunctions and disjunctions (are the effects) of actions, should be set aside U

FIRST BOOK, SECOND DAILY LESSON

Causation. कारणाभावात् कार्याभावः ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 From non-existence of cause is non-existence of effect.

[2] It *may* be *said,* In *the foregoing daily lesson similarity* between the categories, substance, quality, and action, as constituted by the notion of effect and the notion of cause, has been explained How is this possible? *for* while the relation between effect and cause is not demonstrated it is like talking about the horn of a hare To obviate this Kaṇáda establishes the relation between effect and cause. V.

[3] For it is seen that even when earth, a potter's wheel, water

---

[1] कारणसामान्यपदेन तत्प्रकरणमुपलक्ष्यते तेन कारणसामान्याभिधानप्रकरणे द्रव्यकर्मणी प्रति कर्मणोऽकारणत्वमुक्तं न तु सर्वथाऽकारणमेव कर्मेति विवक्षितं येन संयोगविभागाश्च कर्मणामिति सूत्रं व्याहन्येतेति भावः ॥

[2] ननु पूर्वाह्निके कार्यत्वघटितं कारणत्वघटितञ्च साधर्म्यमुक्तं तत्कथं सङ्गच्छते कार्यकारणभावस्यासिद्धत्वेन शशविषाणसमानत्वादित्यतः कार्यकारणभावमेव व्यवस्थापयति ॥

[3] दृश्यते हि मृच्चक्रसलिलकुलालसूत्रादौ समवहितेऽपि दण्डाभावाद्घटाभावः भूसलिलादौ समवहितेऽपि बीजाभावादङ्कुराभावः स च दण्डघटयोर्बीजाङ्कुरयोर्वा कार्यकारणभावमन्तरेऽनुपपन्नः । अन्यथा वेमाद्यभावेऽपि घटाभावः सिचाशकलाद्यभावेऽप्यङ्कुराभावः स्यात् किञ्च घटपटादीनां कादाचित्कत्वमनुभूयते तदपि हेतुफलभावमन्तरेणानुपपन्नं न हि निमित्तान्तराभावे सति किञ्चित्कालसत्त्वरूपं कादाचित्कत्वं भावानां कारणं हेतुमन्तरेण सम्भवति तदा हि स्यादेव न स्यादेव वा न तु कदाचित् स्यात् न हि भावो न भवत्येव नाप्यहेतोर्भवति नाप्यकस्मादेव भवति न वा निरुपाख्यादेव शशविषाणादेर्भवति किन्तु दण्डवेमादेः सोपाख्यस्यावधेर्घटपटादौ कार्ये दर्शनादवधिस्तु कारणमेव एवं कार्यकारणभावाभावे प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्ती न स्यातां तथा च निरीहं जगज्जायेत न हीष्टसाधनताज्ञानमन्तरेण प्रवृत्तिरनिष्टसाधनताज्ञानमन्तरेण निवृत्तिः ॥

a potter thread &c are brought together from non existence of a potter s staff there is non existence of the pot, and though earth water &c, be brought together, from non existence of a seed there is non existence of a shoot. This relation between the potter's staff and the pot, and between the seed and the shoot is impossible without the relation of cause and effect, for otherwise there would be non existence of the pot also in the case of non-existence of a loom, and non existence of the shoot even in the case of non existence of a fragment of stone &c Moreover it is observed that a pot, a piece of cloth, and the like exist only from time to time This too would be impossible without the relation between cause and effect, for the temporary existence of things which are, which consists in their being at one time and not being at another, is impossible without connexion with a cause For in this case (were there no connexion with a cause), a thing might be or not be, but could not be from time to time, since an existing thing is not non existent nor does it come into existence without a cause, nor does it come into existence fortuitously nor does it come into existence from anything unreal such as the horn of a hare but from a really existing assignable determinant such as a staff or a loom as is seen in effects such as a pot or a piece of cloth Now the limit or determinant is the cause Moreover were there no relation of cause and effect there would no activity or inactivity for in such a case the universe would be desireless since without a knowledge of the means of attaining that which is desired there would be no such thing as activity and without the knowledge of the means of avoiding that which is undesired there would be no such thing as inactivity U

*Continued

न तु कार्याभावात् कारणाभावः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 But there is not from non existence of effect non existence of cause

[1] If there were not a restriction in the relation between cause and effect, it would follow also that if the effect should not exist the cause would not exist The rule is not that non existence of effect results in non existence of cause, but that non-existence of cause results in non-existence *of effect Therefore the practical* application of this introductory section of two aphorisms is that persons desirous of emancipation are concerned in non existence of birth for the sake of non existence of pain in non-existence of *activity for the sake of non existence of birth in non existence* of faults for the sake of non existence of activity, in the cessation of false knowledge for the sake of non existence of faults and in forming a mental presentation of the soul for the sake of cessation of false knowledge U

Generality and particularity

सामान्य विशेप इति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 Generality and particularity both depend upon intellection

[2] After the enunciation and definition of the first three *categories he now states the definition of the category* generality formerly enunciated Generality is *twofold* highest and not highest The highest is being, the not highest is substantiality &c, contained under being The distinguishing property of generality and particularity is intellection Extensive intellection *is that of generality* exclusive intellection is that of particularity

[3] Generality is the highest and particularity the not highest

---

[1] यदि कार्यकारणभावनियमो न भवति तदा कार्याभावादपि कारणाभावः स्यात् कार्याभावः कारणाभावप्रयुक्तः कारणाभावस्तु कार्याभावं प्रति तन्त्रं तेन दुःखाभावार्थं जन्माभावे जन्माभावार्थं प्रवृत्त्यभावे तदर्थञ्च दोषाभावे तदर्थं मिथ्याज्ञाननिवृत्तये तदर्थं ञ्चात्मसाक्षात्काराय मुमुक्षुणा प्रवृत्तिः प्रयोजनमौपोद्घातिकस्यास्य द्विसूत्रप्रकरणस्य ॥

[2] पदार्थत्रयोद्देशलक्षणानन्तरमिदानीमुद्दिष्टस्य सामान्यपदार्थस्य लक्षणमाह । सामान्यं द्विविधं परमपरञ्च तत्र परं सत्ता अपरं सत्ताव्याप्यं द्रव्यत्वादि तत्र सामान्यस्य तद्विशेषस्य च लक्षणं बुद्धिरेव । अनुवृत्तबुद्धिः सामान्यस्य व्यावृत्तबुद्धिर्विशेषस्य ॥

[3] सामान्यं परं विशेषः अपरं सामान्यम् इति द्वयं बुद्ध्यपेक्षं बुद्धिरपेक्षालक्षणं यस्य तत् तथा च सामान्यं द्विविधं परमपरञ्च तत्र परसामान्यं सत्ता द्रव्यत्वादिकन्त्वपरसामान्यं

generality Accordingly there are two kinds of generality That is dependent upon intellection which has intellection for its characteristic. Generality then is twofold highest and not highest The highest generality is being the not highest generality is substantiality &c The distinguishing property of the highest and not highest kinds of generality is intellection the intellection of extensiveness being the characteristic of generality i e of highest generality and the intellection of non extensiveness the chracteristic of particularity (i e of not highest generality) Extensiveness is existence in many places non-extensiveness is existence in few places. Being therefore is the highest because it exists in more places than any other universal and the classes substantiality &c. are not highest because they exist in fewer places than the notion of earth &c so that generality or the highest and particularity or the not highest universals are not absolute but relative to intellection The following hindrances to universality are enumerated by the Nyaya teachers Indivisibility of the individual identity confusion infinite regression loss of form and absence of connection are the aggregate of things preventing universality Thus the notion of ether is not a class because it exists only as one individual The notions of a pitcher and a water pot are not two universals because there are neither more nor less individuals under either The notions of matter and form are not one universal because of the

---

तत्र सामान्यविशेषयोः परापरयोर्लक्षणं बुद्धिरेव अनुवृत्तत्वबुद्धिः सामान्यस्य व्यावृत्तत्व बुद्धिर्विशेषस्य लक्षणम् अनुवृत्तत्वम् अधिकदेशवृत्तित्वं व्यावृत्तत्वमल्पदेशवृत्तित्वं तथा च सत्तायाः सर्वसामान्यापेक्षया ऽधिकदेशवृत्तित्वात् परत्वमत्र द्रव्यत्वादिजातेस्तु सत्तापेक्षया न्यूनदेशवृत्तित्वादपरत्वं पृथिवीत्वाद्यपेक्षया ऽधिकदेशवृत्तित्वात् परत्वमपीति परत्वरूपं सामान्यत्वम् अपरत्वरूपं विशेषत्वञ्च न नियतं किन्तु बुद्ध्यपेक्षमिति । जातिबाधका उक्ता न्यायाचार्यैः व्यक्तेरभेदस्तुल्यत्वं सङ्करोऽथानवस्थितिः । रूपहानिरसम्बन्धो जातिबाधकसङ्ग्रह इति । तत्रैकव्यक्तिकत्वादाकाशत्वं न जातिः अन्यूनानतिरिक्तव्यक्तिकत्वाद् घटत्वं कलसत्वञ्च न जातिद्वयं परस्परात्यन्ताभावसमानाधिकरणयोरेकव्यक्तिसमावेशेन सङ्करेण भूतत्वं मूर्तत्वञ्च न जातिः अनवस्थाभयात् सामान्यत्वं न जातिः विशेषत्वं व्यावृत्तस्वभावस्य रूपहानिर्विशेषत्वजातिबाधिका समवायसम्बन्धाभावात् समवायत्वं न जातिः समवाये समवायान्तरस्वीकारे ऽनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् ॥

confusion pervading the one individual by reason of two common substrata of absolute mutual non-existence Generality is not a universal for if so there would be a regress to infinity The notion of particularity is prevented from being a universal by loss of form *for particularity is naturally exclusive* The notion of co-inhesion is not a class because of the non-existence of connection by co inhe ion, for from the assumption that co-inhesion inheres in anything else a *regression to infinity would follow* V

Cp the Muktavali on Bhāshā parichchheda 8 [1] The cha racteristic *of generality is co-inhesion in more than one together* with eternity It is said 'Together with eternity because co inhe sion in more than one belongs also to conjunction &c It is said 'In *more than one because co inhesion together with eternity* be longs also to ether, to extension, and the like

Existence is uni versal

भावोऽनुवृत्तेरेव हेतुत्वात् सामान्यमेव ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Existence is general only for it is a cause of ex-tensive intellection

[2] Existence—being—[*is general*] *because it is a cause of ex*-tensive intellection—of the notion of existing in many places the word only (*eva*) excludes the notion of existence in few places V

द्रव्यत्वं गुणत्वं कर्मत्वञ्च सामान्यानि विशेषाश्च ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 The essences of substance quality and action are general and particular

[3] The particle and (*cha*) implies in addition the notions of earth &c the classes contained in substance the notions of

---

[1] सामान्यमिति । तल्लक्षणन्तु नित्यत्वे सत्यनेकसमवेतत्वम् । अनेकसमवेतत्वं संयोगादीनामप्यस्त्यत उक्तम् । नित्यत्वे सतीति । नित्यत्वे सति समवेतत्वं गगनपरिमाणादीनामप्यस्त्यत उक्तम् अनेकेति ॥

[2] भावः सत्ता अनुवृत्तेरधिकदेशवृत्तित्वबुद्धेर्हेतुत्वात् एवकारेणाल्पदेशवृत्तित्वव्यवच्छेदः ॥

[3] चकारः पृथिवीत्वादीनि द्रव्यगतजातीः रूपत्वादीनि गुणगतजातीः उत्क्षेपणत्वादीनि कर्मगतजातीः समुच्चिनोति ॥

colour &c the classes contained in quality, and the notions of throwing upwards &c, the classes contained in action U

अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो विशेषेभ्यः ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 *With the exception of the ultimate particulars*

[1] The words general and particular [in the preceding aphorism] are to be understood with the exception of those particulars that are said to exist as *eternal substances* *According to* the teachers [of this system] they are ultimate, because they exist in the end or conclusion [of the division of a compound substance] *and there is [then] nothing further which causes non extensive conception* According to the authors of the Vritti they are ultimate because they exist at the end or conclusion of production and destruction, and are ultimate particulars because they exist in eternal substances For those particulars only are causes of non-extensive conception, and are not at the same time general in their character U

सदिति यतो द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु सा सत्ता ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 That is existence from which [there arises the *conviction*] with respect to substances qualities and *actions, that* they are existent

Existence is not identical with substance &c

द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो ऽर्थान्तरं सत्ता ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Existence is something different from substances qualities, and actions

[2] It might be said, Existence is not apprehended by means

---

[1] अन्त्या विशेषा नित्यद्रव्यवृत्तयो ये ऽभिहिता. तान् वर्जयित्वा सामान्यविशेषाभिधानमित्यर्थः । अन्ते ऽवसाने भवन्तीत्यन्त्या यतो न व्यावर्तकान्तरमस्तीत्याचार्याः उत्पादविनाशयोरन्ते ऽवसाने भवन्तीत्यन्त्या नित्यद्रव्याणि तेषु भवन्तीत्यन्त्या विशेषा इति वृत्तिकृत. । ते हि विशेषा एव व्यावृत्तिबुद्धिहेतवो न तु सामान्यरूपा अपीति ॥

[2] ननु द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यः पृथग्भावेन सत्ता नानुभूयते ऽतो द्रव्याद्यन्यतममेव सत्ता यतो हि यद्भिन्नं भवति तस्ततो भेदेनानुभूयते यथा घटः पटात् न च सत्ता तेभ्यो भेदेनानुभूयत इति सदात्मिकैवेत्यत आह ॥ द्रव्यादयो ऽननुगताः सत्ता चानुगता । तया च अनुगतत्वाननुगतत्वलक्षणविरुद्धधर्माध्यासेन तेभ्यो भेदस्य सिद्धत्वात् ॥

like existence is declared to be distinct from substances quali ties, and actions on account of its existence or co-inhesion in qualities only U

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 Also by the non existence [in it] of generality and particularity

[1] He states another distinction If the universal in quality were not something over and above substances qualities and actions, it would then be apprehended as constituting a class con tained under one or other of the universals substance quality, or action U

The essence of action.

कर्मसु भावात् कर्मत्वमुक्तम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 The essence of action is explained from its exis tence in actions

[2] He states the distinction of the universal in action from sub-stances qualities and actions The essence of action is also explain ed, like existence to be another class distinct from substances qualities, and actions on account of its existence or co inhesion in action only U

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Also by the non existence [in it] of generality particularity

[3] If the essence of action were identical with substances &c the generality and particularity of substances &c, would inhere

---

[1] भेदकान्तरमाह । यदि द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो गुणत्वमतिरिक्तं न भवेत्तदा द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वतदवान्तरजातिमत्तया उपलभ्येतेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो भेदकं कर्मत्वस्याह । कर्मत्वेन भावात् समवायात् कर्मत्वमपि जात्यन्तरं द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो भिन्नमुक्तं सत्तावदित्यर्थः ॥

[3] कर्मत्वं यदि द्रव्याद्यात्मकं भवेत्तदा द्रव्यत्वादिसामान्यविशेषस्तत्र समवेयादित्यर्थः । सेयमेकाकारा चतुःसूत्री सत्ताद्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वानां चतसृणां जातीनां द्रव्यगुणकर्मभेदप्रतिपादनाय एकप्रकरणेनोक्तेत्यवधेयम् ॥

in it It is to be understood that these four aphorisms alike in form [viz 10, 12, 14 16] are stated in one section to explain the distinction from substances qualities, and actions, of the four universals existence substantiality the universal in quality and the universal in action U

Existence is one

सदिति लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भा- वः ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 Because of the non particularity of the property of being, and of the *non existence of a particular property* therein there is [only] one existence

[1] A conception in the form of being or the applicability of that word is the property of existence This conception is common, without distinction in regard to substances qualities, and actions Hence existence or being abides in them as only one For otherwise either being would not exist, or they would not exist, for existence is in the same number of individuals as substance &c Because of the non existence of a particular property —the meaning of this is that *from the non-existence of a property or ground of* inference in particularity or distinction there is no distinction For there is no particular property in existence like the particular property or distinction of extension of length and shortness in the case of the inference, 'That is the selfsame lamp U

SECOND BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

Qualities of earth

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शवती पृथिवी ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 *Earth is possessed of colour, taste, smell and touch.*

---

[1] सदित्याकारकं ज्ञानं सच्छब्दप्रयोगो वा सत्ताया लिङ्गं तच्च द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु सामान्यविशिष्टं तेन भाव सत्ता सर्वत्र तेषु वर्तते अन्यथा द्रव्यत्वादिवत्तुल्यव्यक्तिकतया सत्ता वा न स्यात् तानि वा न स्युः विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चेति विशेषो भेदस्तत्र यल्लिङ्गमनुमानं तदभावाच्च न भेद इत्यर्थः । भवति हि स एवायं दीप इत्यनुगमस्तत्र यथा विशेषलिङ्गं दीर्घह्रस्वादिपरिमाणभेदस्तथात्र विशेषलिङ्गं नास्तीति भावः ॥

[1] The colour of the earth is of many kinds blue yellow &c Hence the characteristic of possessing universality contained under the universality of substance and being the general substratum of blue colour So also there is in the earth taste of various kinds pungent *astringent* &c Hence the characteristic of possessing a universality contained under the universal existence and being the general substratum of pungent taste In like manner by the substitution of the words 'astringent &c, *other characteristics* are to be inferred Smell is of two kinds fragrant and unfragrant Hence the characteristic of possessing a universality contained under the universal substantiality and being the general substratum of smell Thus too it will be seen that the notion of substance is a substratum of classes which are substrata not general of qualities which are substrata general or not general of odour It must not be objected that as smell and taste are not observed in a stone &c both these qualities are not invariably present. For even though smell and taste accidentally be not observed in it they are observed in its ashes The self same particles which were originally constituent of the stones are also originally constituent of its ashes Therefore the presence of these attributes is not merely occasional If it be asked How then is a breeze fragrant and water mixed with Karavella [a kind of gourd] bitter? This is no objection for the taste and smell of those are conditions produced by

---

[1] रूपं नीलपीताद्यनेकप्रकारं पृथिव्यां एव । तथा च नीलरूपसमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं लक्षणं एव रसः कटुकषायाद्यनेकप्रकारकः पृथिव्यामेव तथा च कटुरससमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं लक्षणं एव कषायादिपदप्रक्षेपेण लक्षणान्यूहनीयानि । गन्धो द्विविधः सुरभिरसुरभिश्च तथा च गन्धसमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं लक्षणं तथा गन्धसमानाधिकरणगन्धासमानाधिकरणगुणासमानाधिकरणजात्यधिकरणद्रव्यत्वं द्रष्टव्यम् । न च पाषाणादौ गन्धरसयोरननुभवात् सर्वाव्यापकमिदमुभयमपीति वाच्यं सर्वापाततो गन्धरसयोरननुभवेऽपि तदीयभस्मसु तदुपलम्भात् य एवावयवाः पाषाणारम्भकास्त एव तद्भस्मारम्भका अपीति नाव्याप्तिः कथं तर्हि सुरभि समीरणः तिक्तं कारवेल्लजलमिति प्रतीतिरिति चेन्न विशेषाधिकरणत्वात् तयोर्गन्धरसयोः स्पर्शोऽप्यनुष्णाशीतः पाकजः पृथिव्यामेव तथा च पाकजस्पर्शसमानाधिकरणद्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं लक्षणं पाकजत्वञ्च विशेषान्तरव्यावृत्तं पृथिवीस्पर्श एव विशेषान्तरञ्च शिरीषलवङ्गीकुसुमादौ स्पर्शविशेषे स्फुटतरम् ॥

the earth There is a touch in the earth, neither hot nor cold, but temperate Hence the characteristic of possessing a universality contained under the universal substance and being the general substratum of the feeling of temperate warmth Temperate warmth may be clearly explained by another description, that it is the touch *of the earth*, *another description is clearer, viz, that it is a species* of touch residing in the flowers of the Śirīśa, Lavangī &c. U.

Qualities of water रूपरसस्पर्शवत्य आपो द्रवाः स्निग्धाः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Water is *possessed of colour, taste, and touch and* is fluid and viscid

[1] In water the colour is white, the taste sweet, the touch cold, the fluidity natural Thus in the aphorism on water by the enumeration of five qualities, five characteristics of water are implied by the sage The characteristics of water are that it is a class preceptibly contained under the universal substance and existing in possession of colour not the general substratum of bright and white but the general substratum of blue colour It is a class

---

[1] जले रूपं शुक्लं रसो मधुरः स्पर्शः शीतः द्रवत्वं सांसिद्धिकं तथा च तत्सूत्रे पञ्चानां गुणानामुपादानात् पञ्चैव जललक्षणानि मुनेरभिप्रेतानि । तथा च नीलसमानाधिकरणभास्वरशुक्लासमानाधिकरणरूपवद्वृत्तिद्रव्यत्वसाक्षाद्व्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं तिक्तावृत्तिमधुरवृत्तिद्रव्यत्वसाक्षाद्व्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं शीतस्पर्शवत्त्वं सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्ववत्त्वं स्नेहवत्त्वमित्येतानि लक्षणानि जलस्येति भावः । हिमकरकादौ यदि न सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वं तदा सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्ववद्वृत्तिद्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वं विवक्षणीयम् । लवणोदकालिन्दीजलादौ या नीलोपलब्धिः सा आश्रयौपाधिकी भ्रान्तिरेव वियति विक्षेपे तस्यैव धवलिमोपलब्धेः यद्यपि जले कोऽपि रसो नानुभूयते तथापि हरीतक्यादिकषायद्रव्यभक्षणानन्तरं जलमाधुर्यमनुभूयत एव तस्य तद्व्यञ्जकत्वात् । सूर्यकरादिसंयोगाज्जले यदुष्णस्पर्शः प्रतीयते सोऽपि सूर्यकरादेरेव यद्यपि हिमकरकादौ द्रवत्वं नानुभूयते इति मतं तस्य जले अन्तर्भावः सम्भवति तथापि उष्मणा विलीने तत्र जलत्वं प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमेव दिव्यतेजःसंयोगात्तु तत्र द्रवत्वप्रतिरोधः काठिन्यप्रतीतिस्तु तत्र भ्रान्तिरेवेति मुक्तावलीकारः । केचित्तु दिव्यतेजःसंयोगात् जलपरमाणुभ्यां द्व्यणुकं तैश्च त्रसरेण्वादिकं क्रमेण हिमादौ जायते तादृशद्व्यणुकादिकञ्च द्रवत्वरहितं कठिनमेवेति हिमादौ काठिन्यप्रतीतिर्न भ्रान्तिरित्याहुः । स्नेहस्तु जलस्य घृतादावपि तदुपलम्भकजलस्यैव स्नेहः तत्प्रकर्षाच्च घृतादेर्दहनानुकूलत्वं सक्तुसिकतादौ पिण्डीभावहेतुः सङ्ग्रहनामकः संयोगविशेषो द्रवत्वसहितस्नेहकारित एव द्रवत्वमात्रकारितत्वे काचकाञ्चनद्रवत्वादिव तदुत्पत्तेर्नापि स्नेहमात्रकारितः घनीभूतघृतादिभिरपि तदुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् ॥

perceptibly contained under the universal substance existing as something sweet and not existing as something bitter It is possessed of cold touch, of *intrinsic fluidity and of viscidity* If there is no natural fluidity in ice, hail, &c, it must be understood that they belong to a class included under the universal substance and existing in the *possession of intrinsic fluidity* The *observation of* blue colour in the sea, the water of the Kálindí (Yamuná) &c., is an illusion produced by the conditions of the substratum, for when *it is tossed into the air it is perceived to be white* Though no taste be perceived in water, yet after eating astringent substances such as yellow myrobalan, sweetness is observed in water, for it is *distinguished by that* [taste] The *hot touch which* appears in water through conjunction with the sun's rays &c., belongs properly to the sun's rays &c Though it might be asked, inasmuch as *fluidity is not perceived in ice, hail &c, how it is possible that it* should be contained in water yet when the ice hail &c, are melted with heat, it is proved sensibly to be water The author of the *Muktávalí maintains that its fluidity is not derived from* conjunction with celestial light, but the appearance of solidity is in those cases an illusion But some contend that [through conjunction with celestial light *there are produced in ice &c, successively from* aqueous atoms an *aggregate of two atoms an aggregate of three* atoms and so forth, and that such aggregates of two or more atoms are destitute of fluidity] and solid and that accordingly the appearance of solidity is not an illusion There is also viscidity in water, and that of clarified butter and the like is the viscidity of the water which is *one of* the ingredients It is through the excess of this that clarified butter &c. is highly *inflammable* That kind of conjunction which is called agglomeration, and which consists *in meal, sand &c*, becoming globular, is caused by viscidity accompanied with fluidity Were it caused by *fluidity* alone, it would be produced from the fluidity of glass, gold &c . Nor is it produced by viscidity alone for then it would follow that it would be produced also *by thickened clarified butter &c* V



Q al t s of l ght   तेजो रूपस्पर्शवत् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 Light has colour and touch

[1] Light [or heat] is possessed of luminous colour and touch. If it be objected Luminousness is the giving of light to other bodies and such colour is not fo ind in heat or in such light as in exists in gold in a frying pan or in water White colour is nowhere *found in these nor is a hot feel foun l in moonlight or gold* How then is this so ? We reply that it may be inferred that luminous colour exists in heat &c because they are light If it be said Lum nosity is not proved to exist in these by their own colour we reply that it is inferred from their possessing a hot feel If it be aske l How is the luminosity [proved to exist in gol l ?] We reply that it will be explained that it is because it is inferre l to l e light from its being a distinctive substratum of fluidity which is produced but not destroyed by the closest conjunction w th fire and that the existence of light in a frying pan &c is inferred from the possession of heat to the touch For l ght is of four kinds that in which colour and touch predominate as sunlight, that in which colour predominates and touch does not as moonlight that in which neitl er colour nor touch predominates as the eye that in which colour does not, but touch does predominate as the hot season and lgl t as existing in water, a frying pan and the like U

With respect to the relation between light and heat cp

---

[1] रूप भास्वर स्पर्शश्चोष्णस्तद्वत्तेज इत्यर्थः । ननु भास्वरत्वं प्रकाशकत्वं तादृशञ्च रूप नोष्मणि न वा चामीकरस्थे भर्ज्जनकपालस्थे वारिस्थे वा तेजसि । शुक्लञ्च रूपमुक्तेषु न क्वापि उष्णश्च स्पर्शो न चान्द्रे न वा चामीकरे तत् कथमेतदिति चेत्र उष्मादौ तेजस्त्वेन भास्वररूपानुमानात् । तेजस्त्वमेव तत्र स्वरूपासिद्धमिति चेत्र उष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वेन तदनुमानात् चामीकरे कथमिति चेत तत्र भास्वरस्वभावे ऽपि अत्यन्तानलसंयोगेनानुच्छिद्यमानजन्यद्रवत्वाधिकरणत्वेन व्यतिरेकिणा तेजस्त्वानुमानादिति वक्ष्यमाणत्वात् भर्ज्जनकपालादिनिष्ठे चोष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वेन तजस्त्वानुमानात् । चतुर्विधं हि तेज किञ्चिदुद्भूतरूपस्पर्शं यथा सौरादि किञ्चिदुद्भूतरूपस्पर्शं यथा नयनम किञ्चिदनुद्भूतस्पर्शं यथा निदाघ वारिभर्ज्जनकपालादिगतञ्च तज ॥

Muktávali on Bháshá parichchheda v 40 [1] Heat is a particular class existing in touch and is known by perception So also light is a particular class which is the inherent cause of the feeling of generated heat It is not to be maintained that the possession [by light] of a hot feel cannot be predicated of the rays of the moon &c, for heat exists there too but is not recognised because it is overpowered by the touch of the water which they contain In like manner it is not recognised in the brilliance of a gem because it is overpowered by an earthy feel, nor in the eye &c because it does not there predominate

Quality of air स्पर्शवान् वायुः ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Air is possessed of touch

[2] We are here to understand a touch that is neither temperate nor hot nor cold A touch of a different class belonging to the air is understood The possession of such a heterogeneous touch is the characteristic of air and the heterogeneity of the touch of the air is known by perception. V

Ether त आकाशे न विद्यन्ते ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 *Those [qualities] do not exist in ether*

[3] Those [qualities] colour taste smell and touch do not exist in ether The appearance in ether of whiteness like that of coagulated milk is an illusion caused by the whiteness of the rays of

---

[1] उष्णत्वं स्पर्शनिष्ठो जातिविशेषः प्रत्यक्षसिद्धः । इत्थञ्च जन्योष्णस्पर्शसमवायिकारणतावच्छेदकं तेजस्त्वं जातिविशेषः । न चोष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वं चन्द्रकिरणादावव्याप्तमिति वाच्यम् । तत्रापि उष्णस्य सत्त्वात् । किन्तु तदन्तःपातिजलस्पर्शेनाभिभवाच्चक्षुरादौ चानुद्भूतत्वादग्रहः ॥

[2] अत्र स्पर्शो ऽपाकजो ऽनुष्णाशीतो ग्राह्यः तेन वायवीयो विजातीयस्पर्शो लभ्यते तथा च तादृशविजातीयस्पर्शवत्त्वमेव वायुलक्षणं वैजात्यं तु वायुस्पर्शे प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमिति ॥

[3] ते रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा आकाशे न सन्तीत्यर्थः । दधिधवलिमाकाशमिति प्रतीतिस्तु सूर्यकरधवलिमोपाधिकी भ्रान्तिरेव नीलं नभ इति प्रतीतिरपि सुमेरोर्दक्षिणदिगवस्थितस्यन्द्रनीलमणिमयशिखरस्य नीलमविषयिणी भ्रान्तिरेव कश्चित्तु सुदूरगतस्य परावर्तमानस्य चक्षुषः स्वगोलकस्थकनीनिकाग्रहणात् तद्गतनीलरूपविषयिणी तादृशप्रतीतिरित्याहुस्तच्च पिङ्गलतारनयनानामपि तथोपलम्भादिति हृदयम् ॥

the sun The appearance also of blueness in the sky is an illusion occasioned by the blueness of the sapphire peak situated on the south side of mount Meru Some maintain that this appearance *is occasioned by the blueness of the pupil of the eye* from the eye's falling upon its own pupil after travelling to a distance and returning This is not the case for those whose eyes are tawny have the same perception V

सर्पिर्जतुमधूच्छिष्टानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवत्वमद्भिः सामान्यम् ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 The fluidity through conjunction with fire, of clarified butter, lac, and wax is common to them and water

[1] The fluidity which belongs to clarified butter &c, *is due to* a special cause, the conjunction of them with fire and is not intrinsic Such intrinsic fluidity is the characteristic of water Only fluidity is common to earth and water, not natural fluidity Hence there is not too much asserted U

[2] The fluidity of clarified butter &c. which is due to a special *cause,* is like the *intrinsic fluidity existing in water,* because the class constituted by the universal *fluidity* exists in both, but there is in clarified butter &c no possession of natural fluidity Fluid in the aphorism on water (II 1 2) has the special meaning of natural fluidity Accordingly there is no discrepancy V

त्रपुसीसलोहरजतसुवर्णानामग्निसंयोगाद्द्रवत्वमद्भिः सामान्यम् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 The fluidity, through conjunction with fire of tin, lead iron silver, and gold, is common to them with water

---

[1] सर्पिरादीनां यद्द्रवत्वमस्ति तदग्निसंयोगाख्यनिमित्तात् न तु सांसिद्धिकं तादृशञ्चापां लक्षणं द्रवत्वमात्रन्तु पृथिव्या अद्भिः सामान्यं न तु सांसिद्धिकं द्रवत्वमपीति नातिव्याप्तिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] घृतादीनां यन्नैमित्तिकं द्रवत्वं तज्जलगतसांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वतुल्यं द्रवत्वत्वजातेरुभयत्र सत्त्वात् सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वं तु घृतादिषु नास्ति जलसूत्रोक्तद्रवपदं सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वविशिष्टपरमिति नासङ्गतिरिति भावः ॥

¹ By the use of the plural number of the word gold white copper, copper, brass quicksilver, &c. are implied The explanation of this aphorism is to be understood as similar to that of the former V

विषाणी ककुद्मान् प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्नावान् इति गोत्वे दृष्टं लिङ्गम् ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 That she has horns a hump a tail hairy at the extremity and a dewlap is the received mark of being a cow

² As in the case of the universal cow the marks of possessing horns &c. are generally received or universally assumed means of proof, so with respect to air the mark of touch &c, is also the means of proof This is the inner meaning of this and the following aphorism In the former of these aphorisms in the mention of the cow's having horns the verb to be is implied Accordingly a particular kind of horn not common to the buffalo is understood and this is a mark of being a cow as also is the possession of a hump That it has a tail hairy at the extremity—according to the derivation 'the hair is situated at the extremity in this' a peculiarity of the body, constituted by the tail is asserted That is a particular cow with a tail hairy at the extremity, whose tail is hairy and particularly so at the extremity With respect to the tail of the sheep &c, there is not hairiness at the extremity for the whole tail is hairy

---

¹ सुवर्णानामिति बहुवचनेन कांस्यताम्रपित्तलपारदादीनामप्युपग्रहः । व्याख्यानञ्चास्य सूत्रस्य पूर्ववदेव बोध्यम् ॥

² यथा गोत्वे विषाणित्वादीनि लिङ्गानि सामान्यतो दृष्टानि लोकसिद्धानि प्रमाणानि तथा अतीन्द्रिये वायौ स्पर्शादीनि लिङ्गान्यपि प्रमाणानीति सूत्रद्वयनिगूढार्थः । तत्र प्रथमसूत्रे विषाणीति प्रमाणमस्त्यर्थे प्रत्ययः तेन च महिषादिव्यावृत्तो विषाणविशेषो लभ्यते स च गोत्वे लिङ्गम् एवं ककुद्मत्त्वमपि । प्रान्ते वालधिरिति अन्ते वाला आधीयन्ते ऽस्मिन्निति व्युत्पत्त्या पुच्छरूपाङ्गविशेष उच्यते प्रकृष्टो ऽन्ते वालधिर्यस्य स प्रान्तेवालधिर्गोपिण्ड मेषादिपुच्छे तु सामस्त्येन वालवत्त्वान्नान्ते वालधित्वं महिषादिपुच्छे प्रलम्बत्वादिरूपप्रकर्षाभावात् पुच्छविशेषो गोत्वे लिङ्गम् सास्ना गलकम्बलं तद्वत्ता गोत्वे लिङ्गम् विषाणीत्यादिव्यवहारविषयतावच्छेदकम् इति शब्देन परामृश्यते अत्राय प्रयोग अयं गौर्विषाणविशेषवत्त्वात् ककुद्मत्त्वात् पुच्छविशेषवत्त्वात् सास्नावत्त्वात् पूर्वानुभूतगोपिण्डवदिति ॥

As there is nothing remarkable on account of pendulousness &c in the tail of the buffalo &c a peculiarity in the tail is a mark of being a cow The dewlap is a particular formation in the neck the possession of which *is a mark of the class cow By the word* '&c' is pointed out the distinctive attribute of being an object com monly *known by* the possession of horns &c The practical cognition is This is a cow because it possesses horns a hump a particular kind of tail or a dewlap as was the case with particular cows formerly observed V

¹ As with respect to the universal cow the horns &c are properties [mark] recognised as predicable of the whole class [*known to prevade it*], so also the properties [marks] *of air and the* other five supersensible substances [viz ether, space time soul and the internal organ] recognised generally come to be a means of proof U

Existence of air proved

स्पर्शश्च वायोः ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Also touch is [a mark] of air

² Having stated the validity of [this form of] inference which effects the requirements of common life he proves by it the existence of air The word mark is to be supplied The particle and *implies also sound wafting and agitating The sense of the* aphorism is therefore that the existence of the air is inferred from a heterogeneous touch from the rustling of leaves &c from the wafting aloft of grass cotton &c and from the agitation of branches &c V

Its properties invisible

न च दृष्टानां स्पर्श इत्यदृष्टलिङ्गो वायुः ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 And it is not the touch which belongs to visible things *therefore air has an invisible mark*

---

¹ यथा गोत्वं प्रति विषाणादीनि लिङ्गानि गृहीतव्याप्तिकानि तथा ऽतीन्द्रियवाय्वादिद्रव्यपञ्चकलिङ्गान्यपि सामान्यतो दृष्टानि प्रमाणभावमासादयन्तीति भावः ॥

² एवं लोकयात्रानिर्वाहकस्यानुमानस्य प्रामाण्यमुक्त्वा ऽनुमानेन वायुं साधयति । लिङ्गमित्यनुषज्यते चकारः शब्दधृतिकम्पान् समुच्चिनोति तथा च विजातीयस्पर्शेन पर्णादिशब्देन नभसि तृणतूलादीनां धृत्या शाखादीनां कम्पेन च वायुरनुमीयते इति भावः ॥

[1] This touch which is made the ground of inference does not belong to earth, water, and light which are visible for it is unaccompanied with colour Accordingly, since it must be inferred that this touch has some substratum, air has an invisible mark or a mark that is observed generally, and is ascertained to exist *from the force of the* properties of the ground of the inference U

[2] That touch from which as being its substratum, air is *inferred [to exist] does not belong to visible things viz, earth* water, and light For this reason air has an invisible mark It has, as being a substratum *a mark which is not visible, wherefore* the resultant sense is that air has for its mark a touch which does not exist in visible things V

Air a substance — **अद्रव्यवत्त्वेन द्रव्यम् ॥ ११ ॥**

Aph 11 It is a *substance because of its not inhering in any substance*

[3] *That of which a* substance is the substratum is said to inhere in that substance, that of which a substance is not the substratum does not inhere in a substance The sense is that air is not inherent in any substance Accordingly the substance air has like ether, an atomic characteristic For all other categories inhere in substance, and inherence belongs to all except the eternal substances, *for according to this explanation, since a combination of two atoms* is originated by primary atoms the material

---

[1] अयं स्पर्शो य इह क्रियते स दृष्टानां पृथिव्यप्तेजसां न भवति रूपासहचरत्वात् तथा चायं स्पर्शः क्वचिदाश्रित इत्यनुमेयमित्यदृष्टलिङ्गः सामान्यतो दृष्टलिङ्गोऽपि वायुः पक्षधर्मताबलादायात इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] येन स्पर्शेन वायुरधिकरणतया ऽनुमीयते स स्पर्शो न दृष्टानां पृथिव्यप्तेजसाम् इति हेतोः वायुरदृष्टलिङ्गः नास्ति दृष्टमधिकरणतया यस्य तादृशं लिङ्गं यस्य स दृष्टावृत्तिस्पर्शलिङ्गको वायुरिति फलितार्थः ॥

[3] द्रव्यमाश्रयभूतमस्यास्तीति द्रव्यवत् न द्रव्यवत् अद्रव्यवत् द्रव्यानाश्रितमित्यर्थः तथा चाकाशवत् परमाणुलक्षणो वायुर्द्रव्यम् अन्येषां पदार्थानां द्रव्याश्रितत्वात् आश्रितत्वञ्चान्यत्र नित्यद्रव्येभ्य इत्यभिधानात् परमाणुभ्यां द्व्यणुकारम्भात् द्व्यणुकादिक्रमेण अवयविनो महत आरम्भस्योपपादनीयत्वादिति ॥

cause of the origin of a large integrate whole is a succession of combinations of two or more atoms U

Continued — क्रियावत्त्वाद्गुणवत्त्वाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Also [air is a substance] from its possessing actions and qualities.

[1] The words The aerial atom is a substance are to be supplied It must be admitted that there exist in the primary atom the possession of qualities such as conjunction originative of combinations of two atoms &c and the possession of action in conformity with those qualities This is not a doubtful and undemonstrated assertion but the means of establishing the existence of primary atoms are a mote in a sunbeam and the like which mote is composed of parts because it is a substance that may be seen with the eye like a water pot The *portions of a mote* are like a half jar [both integrate and integrant] since they are small portions composed also themselves of parts Therefore as in earth &c. there is a primary atom so it must be allowed equally in the case of the air *since there are in each case similar series of* portions and combinations of portions V

Air an eternal substance — अद्रव्यवत्त्वेन नित्यत्वमुक्तम् ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 [Air] is said to be eternal because it does not inhere in any substance

[2] Air in its primary atomic character is to be supplied | A substance is destroyed by the destruction of either its co inherent or its non-coinherent cause A primary atom not being composed of

[1] वायवीयपरमाणुद्रव्यमिति शेष । द्व्यणुकारम्भकसंयोगादिरूपगुणवत्त्वं तदनुकूलक्रियावत्त्वञ्च परमाणावश्यमङ्गीकार्यमिति न सन्दिग्धसिद्धो हेतु परमाणुसिद्धिप्रकारस्तु त्रसरेणु सावयवश्चाक्षुषद्रव्यत्वात् घटवत् त्रसरेणोरवयवा सावयवा महदवयवत्वात् कपालवदित्यादि एवञ्च पृथिव्यादौ यथा परमाणुस्तथा वायुत्वेनापि निराबाध एव अवयवावयविपरम्परायास्तुल्यत्वादिति ॥

[2] परमाणुलक्षणवायोरिति शेष द्रव्यं हि समवायिकारणासमवायिकारणान्यतरनाशान्नश्यति परमाणोस्तु निरवयवतया नैतदुभयमस्ति तथाच विनाशकाभावान्न विनश्यति क्रियावत्त्वे गुणवत्त्वे च सतीति सावयवत्वमुपाधि ॥

parts has neither such cause Therefore there being nothing to destroy it, it is not liable to destruction The being composed of parts is a condition of which the cause is the possession of actions and qualities. U

[1] Of the primary aerial atom is to be supplied That which has no substance as its co inherent cause is said to differ in that respect from that which has a substance as its co inherent cause Y

वायोर्वायुसम्मूर्च्छनं नानात्वलिङ्गम ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 The concurrence of air with air is a mark of its multiplicity

[2] Concurrence of wind with wind or conflict of winds, is a kind of conjunction This conjunction is the meeting two winds of equal velocity, but coming in different directions and different in their action [or motion] It is inferred from the flying upwards of grass cotton &c For the upward motion and concurrence of two winds is invisible But it is inferred that the visible action characterised by the flying upward of visible grass &c., is produced by either a blow or impulse of substance possessing touch and velocity The upward motion of the two winds, the character of which is to move horizontally, being impossible unless they repel each other, proves a mutual repulse. U

वायुसन्निकर्षे प्रत्यक्षाभावाद्दृष्टं लिङ्गं न विद्यते ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 Inasmuch as in the contact with air there is no act of perception there exists [in it] no visible mark

[1] वायुपरमाणोरिति शेषः नास्ति द्रव्यं समवायिकारणं यस्य तद्रूपं द्रव्यसमवायिकारणकमिव तत्त्वेनेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] वायुसम्मूर्च्छनमिति वाय्वोर्वायुना वा सम्मूर्च्छनं संयोगविशेषः । स च समानजवयोर्विरुद्धदिक्क्रिययोः सन्निपातः । स च तृणतूलादीनामूर्ध्वगमनेनानुमीयते वाय्वोरूर्ध्वगमनस्य सन्निपातस्य चातीन्द्रियत्वात् तृणादीनान्तु प्रत्यक्षायामूर्ध्वगमनलक्षणायां क्रियायां प्रत्यक्षायां स्पर्शवद्वेगवद्द्रव्याभिघातनोदनान्यतरजन्यत्वमनुमीयते तथा हि तिर्यग्गमनस्वभावस्य वायोरूर्ध्वगमनं परस्परप्रतिघातमन्तरेणानुपपद्यमानं परस्परप्रतिघातं साधयति ॥

[1] For where there is a visible mark there is a perception of pervasion [universal concomitance] as of fire by smoke, but in the present case *of contact with air*, perception *of pervasion of air* is impossible because air transcends sense. Accordingly there is no mark in air universally concomitant and cognised by perception, and air has therefore an invisible mark. V

सामान्यतो दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16. And inasmuch as its existence is known by general inference it is not a particular.

[2] Not particular means *devoid of particularity* not particularised by particularity and particular is the particular class included in the universal substance *i e* the universal of air. And by inferring from the notion of touch that the touch which is experienced must have some substratum as also that it cannot be one of the *other [substances]* the *notion of its inhesion in a substance other than* the eight substances being established air is proved to be a substance other than the eight substances with respect to the subject which determines that which is to be proved. By general inference means from a mark different from the relation of cause and effect or from a mark other than that of invariable sequence. In the Nyaya Aphorisms it is taught that inference is of three kinds from the antecedent from the subsequent and that which is drawn generally

---

[1] दृष्टं लिङ्गं हि यत्र व्याप्तेः प्रत्यक्षं भवति यथा वह्नेर्धूमः प्रकृते तु वायुसन्निकर्षेऽपि वायुव्याप्तिप्रत्यक्षं न सम्भवति वायोरतीन्द्रियत्वात् तथा च प्रत्यक्षगृहीतव्याप्तिकं लिङ्गं वायोर्नास्तीत्यदृष्टलिङ्गो वायुरिति सुष्ठूक्तमेवेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] अविशेषः विशेषरहितः विशेषाविशेषित इति यावत् विशेषश्च द्रव्यत्वव्याप्यजातिविशेषो वायुत्वं तथा चानुभूयमानः स्पर्शः क्वचिदाश्रितः स्पर्शत्वादित्यनुमानेन इतराबाधसहकृतेन स्पर्शे अष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तद्रव्याश्रितत्वसिद्धौ अष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तद्रव्यत्वेन वायुरपि साध्यतावच्छेदककोटौ सिध्यतीति भावः सामान्यतो दृष्टादिति कार्यकारणभिन्नलिङ्गात् अन्वयव्यतिरेकिलिङ्गादित्यर्थः । न्यायसूत्रे पूर्ववत् शेषवत् सामान्यतो दृष्टं चेति त्रिविधमनुमानमुक्तं तत्र पूर्ववत् कारणलिङ्गकं केवलान्वयि वा शेषवत् कार्यलिङ्गकं केवलव्यतिरेकि वा सामान्यतो दृष्टं कार्यकारणभिन्नलिङ्गकम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकि वा इत्यर्थः ॥

a mark inferential of those beings which are distinguished from ourselves and others The names also of Maitra and the like which are given by a father to a son are virtually given by God by *means of such precepts as* Let a father on the twelfth day give a name to his child Thus it is established that a name is a mark of the existence of God In like manner a work being a product is a mark of the being of a God for the earth &c being *effects* must have a maker, as is the case with a water-pot U

[1] It may be asked How is the omniscience of the maker of words and works proved? Accordingly it is stated A name is produced on perceiving the thing named and an effect is produced on perceiving the material cause. A father and others on seeing the body of a son &c give it a name such as Chaitra or Maitra, and in like manner a potter and others on seeing a piece of earthenware, &c make a water pot &c So it is concluded from the nature of the case that the framer of all applicable names and the maker of the earth &c, which are effects, must be omniscient, for he must know by perception all such things named, and the material causes of earth &c V

The existence of ether

निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनमित्याकाशस्य लिङ्गम् ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 Egress and ingress—such is the mark of the existence of ether

[2] Here the word such expressive of a class includes also throwing upwards, &c. It is a doctrine of the Sankhyas that the

---

[1] ननु सर्वज्ञत्वं संज्ञाकर्मकर्तुः कुतः सिद्धमित्यत आह । संज्ञायाः संज्ञिप्रत्यक्षसाध्यत्वात् कार्यस्य तूपादानप्रत्यक्षसाध्यत्वात् पित्रादिना हि पुत्रादिशरीरं दृष्ट्वैव तत्र चैत्रमैत्रादिसंज्ञा निधीयन्ते तथा कुलालादयोऽपि कपालादिकं दृष्ट्वैव घटादिकं कुर्वन्ति अतो निखिलसाधुसंज्ञाकर्तुर्नामाद्यशेषविषयप्रत्यक्षस्य क्षित्यादिकार्यकर्तुस्तदुपादानप्रत्यक्षस्य चावश्यकत्वात् सर्वज्ञत्वमर्थतस्सम्पन्नमेव ॥

[2] अत्र प्रकारार्थकेतिशब्देनोत्क्षेपणादेरपि ग्रहणं स्पर्शवता मूर्त्तेन निष्क्रमणप्रवेशनस्य शून्यात्मकाकाशं विना अनुपपद्यमानमाकाशनामकं द्रव्यान्तरमनुमापयतीति साङ्ख्यमतम् ॥

motion of tangible bodies i e their egress and ingress being impossible without the existence of ether which is a unoccupied enables us to infer that there is another substance called ether V

सदलिङ्गमेकद्रव्यत्वात् कर्मणः ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 That is not a mark [of the existence of ether] for an action inheres in one substance only

[1] This opinion of the Sankhyas is rejected That egress &c is not a mark is not a mark of existence of ether Since action has one solid substance as its site action which inheres only in that which is solid cannot warrant an inference of the existence of ether as underlying it For an effect which is inherent implies *a co inherent [or material] cause and there is not between ether and* action the relation of inherence and subsistence V

कारणान्तरानुक्लृप्तिवैधर्म्याच्च ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 Also because the properties [of ether] differ from the mark of another cause

[2] It might be urged that egress ingress, &c infer the existence of ether, as being its non coinherent cause Hence this statement is made [Egress and ingress are not a mark of the existence of ether] because its properties differ from the mark of another *cause, viz. of a non-coinherent cause.* U

[3] Agreement (anuklripti) is an abstract term formed by a primary (krit) affix The meaning is therefore that since there exists

---

[1] तदेतन्मत निरस्यति । तत् निष्क्रमणादिकम अलिङ्गम् आकाशस्य लिङ्ग न भवति कर्मणः क्रियाया एक मूर्त द्रव्यमाश्रयो यस्य तत्त्वात् तथा च मूर्तमात्रसमवेत कर्म न समवायितयाकाशानुमानसमर्थ समवेतकार्य हि समवायिकारणमाक्षिपति न चाकाशकर्मणो समवायिसमवेतभाव इत्यर्थ ॥

[2] ननु चासमवायिकारणतयैवाकाशमनुमापयिष्यति निष्क्रमणप्रवेशनादीत्यत आह कारणान्तरस्य असमवायिकारणस्य या ऽनुक्लृप्तिर्लक्षण तद्वैधर्म्यादित्यर्थं ॥

[3] अनुक्लृप्तिरिति कृद्विहितो भाव इति न्यायात् अनुक्लृप्त यादिपतिशाद्युभयसम्मत यत कारणान्तरम असमवायिकारण गुण कर्म च तद्वैधर्म्यात द्रव्यत्वरूपतद्वैधर्म्यस्याकाशे सत्त्वात नासमवायिकारणतयाकाशमनुमापयितु निष्क्रमणादिक शक्नोतीत्यर्थ ॥

in ether a difference of *properties* in consequence of its being a substance from quality and action which are another universally acknowledged cause viz. the non coinherent cause therefore egress &c cannot infer the existence of ether as being its non inherent cause V

संयोगादभावः कर्मणः ॥ २३ ॥

Aph 23 Non existence of action results from conjunction

[1] It is stated that action does not infer the existence of ether as its instrumental cause Since after conjunction there i *non existence i e non production of action,* ether is not in relation to action an instrumental cause The sense is that since it is observed that action (or motion) does not come into being in fruits leaves &c after their conjunction with the ground the instrumental cause of motion is the non existence of a particular kind of conjunction &c and not ether for the negation of ether does not involve the negation of action ether being universally diffused V

कारणगुणपूर्वकः कार्यगुणो दृष्टः ॥ २४ ॥

Aph 24 The quality of an effect is observed to be pre exist *ent in the quality of the cause.*

[2] The way is prepared for the statement that it is sound that necessitates the inference of the existence of ether The particular quality of an effect is observed to pre exist in the cause, as the colour of a water pot &c in portions of the water pot &c. Accordingly the particular quality or sound which is apprehended by the organ of hearing having no prior existence as the quality of

---

[1] निमित्तकारणतया ऽपि नाकाशानुमापकं कर्मेत्याह । यत संयोगात् संयोगानन्तर कर्मणो ऽभाव अनुत्पाद अत आकाश न कर्मणि निमित्तकारणमित्यर्थ । अयं भाव फलपत्रादीना भूम्यादिसंयोगानन्तर कर्मानुत्पत्तिदर्शनात् संयोगविशेषाभावादिकमेव कर्मणि निमित्तकारण न त्वाकाश तद्व्यतिरेकेण कर्मव्यतिरेकस्यासिद्धेस्तस्य व्यापकत्वादिति भाव ॥

[2] शब्द एव आकाशानुमापक इत्यभिधातु भूमिकामारचयति । कार्यस्य यो विशेषगुण स कारणगुणपूर्वक एव दृष्ट यथा घटरूपादि कपालरूपादिपूर्वक तथा च शब्दरूपो यो विशेषगुण श्रोत्रेन्द्रियेणोपलभ्यते तस्य कारणगुणपूर्वकत्वाभावात न कार्यगुणत्व किन्तु नित्यद्रव्यस्यैव गुण शब्द इति शब्दाधारतया नित्यद्रव्यसिद्धिरित्यर्थ ॥

a cause, is not the quality of an effect, but of an eternal substance Thus it is proved that ether, as being that in which sound exists, is an eternal substance V.

कार्यान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च शब्दः स्पर्शवतामगुणः ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 Sound is not a quality of tangible things, since there appears no other effect

[1] It might be urged that sound is observed in a lute, flute, tabour, conch shell drum &c, which are effects, and that consequently it exists previously as a quality of their cause Hence this statement is made Let this be so, then as colour, taste, &c., are observed in threads, in the portions of a pot, &c, and as other homogeneous colour, taste, &c, are perceived in a piece of cloth, a water pot, &c, so a sound homogeneous with that which is observed in the integrant parts of a lute flute, tabour &c, will be found in the integrate whole, in the lute flute, tabour* &c But this is not the case On the contrary it is seen that a lute &c, has its origin *in integrant parts destitute of sound,* whereas it does not appear that a piece of cloth, a water pot, &c., have their origin in *threads* and pieces of earthenware destitute of colour Moreover if sound were a particular quality of tangible things a relation of high and higher and low and lower tones would not be observed, for colours &c, existing in a single complex substance are not perceived to be various in degree, therefore sound is not a particular quality of tangible things U

---

[1] ननु वीणावेणुमृदङ्गशङ्खपटहादौ कार्ये शब्द उपलभ्यते तथा च तत्कारणगुणपूर्वकः स्यादत आह । भवेदेवं यथा तन्तुकपालादिषु रूपरसाद्यनुभूयते तत्सजातीयञ्च रूपरसाद्यन्तरं पटघटादावुपलभ्यते तथा वीणावेणुमृदङ्गाद्यवयवेषु यः शब्द उपलब्धस्तत्सजातीयश्चेत् वीणावेणुमृदङ्गाद्यवयविन्युपलभ्यते न चैवम् प्रत्युत निःशब्दैरेवावयवैर्वीणाद्यारम्भदर्शनात् नीरूपैस्तु तन्तुकपालादिभिः पटघटाद्यारम्भस्यादर्शनात् किञ्च यदि शब्दः स्पर्शवतां विशेषगुणः स्यात् तदा तत्र तारतारतरमन्दमन्दतरादिभावो नानुभूयेत न ह्येकाश्रयसमवायिनो रूपादयो वैचित्र्येणानुभूयन्ते तस्मान्न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः शब्दः ॥

परत्र समवायात् प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च नात्मगुणो न मनोगुणः ॥ २६ ॥

Aph 26 *Since it inheres in* something else and is known by perception sound is neither a quality of the soul nor a quality of the internal organ

[1] If sound were a quality of the soul there would be such cognitions as I am played by the breath or by the hand I am sounding, as there are such *cognitions as I am happy I will I know*, I wish &c But this is not the case, whereas it appears to all that a conch shell is played with the breath and a lute with the hand Moreover sound is not a quality of the soul because it is, like *colour, apprehended by an external organ* So too if sound were a particular quality belonging to the soul it would be like pain &., perceived by a deaf man It is therefore fairly stated that it must inhere in something else. The reason that it is not a quality of the internal organ *is stated to be that it is known by* perception The reason that the words soul and internal organ are not, as they might have been made into one compound word *(átma manase)* is that they may both with equal propriety be said to be known by perception *For the same reason it is implied* that sound is a quality of space and time. U

परिशेषाल्लिङ्गमाकाशस्य ॥ २७ ॥

Aph 27 It remains that sound is a mark of ether

[2] Sound is *to be supplied* Sound must exist in something

---

[1] शब्दो यद्यात्मगुणः स्यात् तदा अहं सुखी अहं जाने इच्छामीत्यादिवत् अहं पूर्ये अहं वाद्ये अहं शब्दवानित्यादिधीः स्यात् न त्वेवमस्ति किन्तु शङ्खः पूर्यते वीणा वाद्यते इति प्रतियन्ति लौकिकाः । किञ्च शब्दो नात्मगुणः बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वात् रूपादिवत् अपि च शब्दो यद्यात्मविशेषगुणः स्याद्बधिरेणाप्युपलभ्येत दुःखादिवत् स्यात् सुष्ठूक्तं परत्र समवायादिति अमनोगुणत्वे हेतुमाह प्रत्यक्षत्वादिति नात्ममनसो गुणः इति समासे कर्तव्ये यदसमासकरणं तेन तुल्यन्यायतया प्रत्यक्षत्वादित्यनेनैव हेतुना दिक्कालयोरपि गुणत्वं शब्दस्य प्रतिषिद्धमिति सूचितम् ॥

[2] शब्द इति शेषः । अत्रापि शब्दः क्वचिदाश्रितो गुणत्वात् रूपादिवदिति सामान्यतोदृष्टाददृष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तद्रव्यसिद्धिः । गुणश्चायं बाह्यैकेन्द्रियग्राह्यजातीयत्वात् रूपादिवत् अनित्यत्वे सति विभुसमवेतत्वात् ज्ञानादिवत् अनित्यत्वञ्च साधयिष्यते । परिशेषसिद्धस्य द्रव्यस्यावयवकल्पनायां प्रमाणाभावान्नित्यत्वं सर्वत्र शब्दोपलब्धेर्विभुत्वम् ॥

because it is a quality like colour &c Thus it is proved by a general inference that there is another substance over and above the eight substances [earth water light air time space the soul, and the internal organ] Sound is a quality because like colour &c. it constitutes a class known by one external organ It will be proved hereafter from its inhering without continuity in an eternal substance that like knowledge it is not eternal. The substance proved by the residuary method is eternal since there is no proof of its being formed of parts and universally diffused, inasmuch as sound is perceived everywhere U

Ether an eternal substance

द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते ॥ २८ ॥

Aph 28 The substantiality and eternity of ether are explained by air

To prove by analogy that the substance that has sound for its mark is a substance and eternal it is stated that as air is eternal because it does not inhere in any substance so also is ether and that as air is a substance because it has qualities so also is ether U

[2] As the primary aerial atom is eternal because it does not inhere in any substance and because it has qualities so also is ether V.

Ether a unit

तत्त्व भावेन ॥ २९

Aph 29 Its unity is explained by existence

[3] As being or existence is one so also is ether only one U

शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्च ॥ ३० ॥

Aph 30 Also because sound its mark is not particular and because there does not exist a particular mark of ether

---

[1] शब्दलिङ्गस्य द्रव्यस्य द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे अतिदेशेन साधयन्नाह । अद्रव्यत्वाद्यथा वायोर्नित्यत्व तथाकाशस्यापि गुणवत्त्वाद्यथा वायोर्द्रव्यत्व तथाकाशस्यापीत्यर्थ ॥

[2] यथा वायुपरमाणोरद्रव्यत्वेन नित्यत्व गुणवत्त्वेन च द्रव्यत्व तथाकाशस्यापीत्यर्थ ॥

[3] भाव सत्ता सा यथैका तथाकाशमप्येकमेवेत्यर्थ ॥

[1] *The unity of ether is established* is to be understood. It being ascertained that it is an eternal substance and that all sounds have that one only substratum it follows that the hypothesis of another substratum would be superfluous Moreover in the conception of ether sound is regarded as its mark and this mark is not particular and there is no other *mark establishing its particularity* or establishing its divisibility It will be stated hereafter that *though knowledge &c are a non particular mark of souls yet there* is a proof of the plurality of souls in another mark which is difference of condition *U*

[2] *As plurality of souls is proved by the consideration that* in one soul at one time an effect is produced in the form of pleasure and in another soul an effect is produced in the form of pain and so there is a difference in two effects of soul pleasure and pain so is it established by the absence of proof to the contrary and by the simplicity of the hypothesis that ether is not manifold but exists as a unit, inasmuch as there is no particularity in sound which is the mark of ether by which the multiplicity of ether might be proved there being no other mark demonstrative of the multiplicity of ether. V

Individuality of ether तदनुविधानादेकपृथक्त्वञ्चेति ॥ ३१ ॥

Aph 31 In conformity with this is its individual unity

---

[1] तत्त्वमाकाशस्य सिद्धमित्यर्थः वैभवे सति सर्वेषां शब्दानां तदेकाश्रयत्वेऽपि पर त्वाश्रयान्तरकल्पनाया कल्पनागौरवप्रसङ्ग अन्यदपि यदाकाश कल्पनीय तत्रापि शब्द एव लिङ्ग तच्चाविशिष्ट न च विशेषसाधक भेदसाधक लिङ्गान्तरमस्ति आत्मना यद्यपि ज्ञानादिकमविशिष्टमेव लिङ्गं तथापि व्यवस्थातो लिङ्गान्तरादात्मनानात्वसिद्धिरिति वक्ष्यते ॥

[2] यथा कुत्रचिदात्मनि कदाचित् सुखरूपमेव कार्यं जायते तदैवान्यस्मिन्नात्मनि तु दुःखरूपमेव कार्यं जायते इत्यात्मकार्ययोः सुखदुःखयोर्वैलक्षण्यादात्मनानात्वं तथाकाशे शब्दरूपलिङ्गस्य न कश्चिद्विशेषो येनाकाशनानात्वं सिध्यति न चाकाशनानात्वसाधकं लिङ्गान्तरमस्ति तथा च प्रमाणाभावात् लाघवाच्चाकाशस्य न नानात्वं किन्त्वेकव्यक्तित्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[1] *The individual unity of ether is proved by its unity from* the consideration of the universal presence of the attribute individual unity wherever unity exists V

[2] The proof of its individual unity is that individual unity necessarily follows unity The particle *iti* indicates the completion of the daily lesson The scope of this section is to state the characteristics of particular substances which possess qualities and are not objects of the cognition of the internal organ Therefore the characteristics of earth water light ether and in connection *with them that of the divine soul are stated in this daily lesson* Accordingly the earth has been said to be possessed of fourteen qualities These qualities are colour taste smell touch number, extension individuality conjunction disjunction highest and not highest generality gravity fluidity and self restitution Exactly the same number of qualities with the exception of smell and with the addition of viscidity belong to water These same qualities with the exception of taste smell viscidity and gravity belong to light and with the exception of smell taste colour gravity viscidity and fluidity to air With the addition of sound number and the four following qualities [extension individuality conjunction and disjunction] belong to ether Only number and the *four following* qualities belong to time and space Number and the four following qualities accompanied with highest and not highest generality and impetus belong to the internal organ Number and the four following qualities and knowledge desire and volition belong to God

[1] यत्र यत्र एकत्वं तत्रैवैकपृथक्त्वमिति व्याप्तेराकाशस्यैकत्वेनैव एकपृथक्त्वसिद्धिरिति ॥

[2] नियमेनैकपृथक्त्वमेकत्वमनुविधत्ते इत्येकपृथक्त्वसिद्धिः इति आह्निकपरिसमाप्तौ । अप्रत्यक्षविषयविशेषगुणवद्द्रव्यलक्षणमाह्निकार्थं । तत्र पृथिव्यप्तेजोवाय्वाकाशानां प्रसङ्गत ईश्वरात्मनश्च लक्षणमस्मिन्नाह्निके तत्र चतुर्दशगुणवती पृथिवी ते च गुणा रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शसंख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वद्रवत्वसंस्काराः । तावन्त एव गन्धमपास्य स्नेहेन सहापाम् । एत एव रसगन्धस्नेहगुरुत्वान्यपास्य तेजसः । गन्धरसरूपगुरुत्वस्नेहद्रवत्वान्यपास्य वायोः । शब्देन सह संख्यादिपञ्चगुणसत्त्वमाकाशस्य संख्यादिपञ्चकमात्रं दिक्कालयोः । परत्वापरत्ववेगसहितं संख्यादिपञ्चकं मनसः । संख्यादिपञ्चकं ज्ञानेच्छाप्रयत्नाश्चेश्वरस्य ॥

SECOND DAILY LESSON

Natural and communicated qualities

पुष्पवस्त्रयोः सति सन्निकर्षे गुणान्तराप्रादुर्भावो वस्त्रे गन्धाभावलिङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1. A flower and a garment being brought into contact, the non-appearance in the garment of another quality is a mark of the non-existence of *smell in the garment*.

[1] With the purpose of investigating smell &c., the characteristics of the elements, it is now established that smell &c. are natural and communicated. Colour, taste, smell, and touch being natural where they are produced in the order of qualities proceeding from causes, become in such cases characteristics, but not in other cases. For the fragrance experienced in a breeze, or the cold experienced on the surface of a stone, or the warmth experienced in water, is not a characteristic. Therefore it is said, A flower and a garment being brought into contact, or when a garment is brought into contact with a golden ketakí (Pandanus Odoratissimus) flower, the fragrance of the golden ketakí which is then experienced does not belong to the garment, for it is not produced from the garment in the order of a quality proceeding from a cause, but is communicated through contiguity with the golden ketakí flower. *For the non-existence of smell in the ketakí* is not a mark of the non-existence of smell in the garment. What then is the mark? It is said to be the non-appearance of smell

[1] इदानीं भूतानां लक्षणानि गन्धादीनि परीक्षिषुर्गन्धादीनां स्वाभाविकत्वमौपाधिकत्वञ्च व्यवस्थापयन्नाह । रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा यत्र कारणगुणप्रक्रमेणोत्पद्यन्ते तत्र स्वाभाविकाः सन्तो लक्षणतामुपयान्ति नान्यथा न हि समीरणे उपलभ्यमानं सौरभं शिलातले उपलभ्यमानं शैत्यं जले उपलभ्यमानमौष्ण्यं वा लक्षणं भवति तदेतदाह पुष्पवस्त्रयोरिति न हि कनककेतकीकुसुमसन्निकृष्टे वाससि कनककेतकीसौरभमुपलभ्यमानं वाससः । न हि वाससः कारणगुणप्रक्रमेण तदुत्पन्नम् किं तर्हि कनककेतकीसन्निधानादौपाधिकं न हि वस्त्रे गन्धाभावे केतकीगन्धाभावो लिङ्गम् । किं लिङ्गमत उक्तं गुणान्तराप्रादुर्भाव इति गुणान्तरात् कारणगुणात् अप्रादुर्भावो ऽनुत्पत्तिः यदि हि वस्त्रे यो गन्ध उपलभ्यते स तस्य स्वाभाविकः स्यात्तदा तदवयवेषु तन्तुषु केतकीसन्निकर्षात् पूर्वं तत्र वस्त्रे सोपलभ्येत न चैवमित्यर्थः तथा च विवादाध्यासितो गन्धो न वस्त्रसमवेतः तदवयवगुणाजन्यविशेषगुणत्वात् शीतोष्णस्पर्शादिवत् ॥

from another attribute *i e* its non appearance or non production from a quality which is a cause For if the smell which is smelt in the *garment be natural*, it will be perceived before the contact with the ketakí in the threads which are its constituent parts This is not the case and therefore the smell in question does not inhere in the garment, inasmuch as the particular quality is *not* produced by the qualities of the integrant parts, as is the case in cold and hot touch and the like U

Smell the characteristic of earth

व्यवस्थितः पृथिव्या गन्धः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2. Smell is established as the mark of earth

[1] The characteristic of earth is stated to be its natural smell Smell discriminated by its disjunction from and junction with other things and by its excluding things of similar and dissimilar classes, is established as the characteristic of earth For the earth indeed has smell and only the earth has smell. It is therefore established that smell, which excludes earth from water and the next seven substances which are of the same class, and from quality and the four following categories which are of a different class, is natural to earth U

Analogously heat is the characteristic of light.

एतेनोष्णता व्याख्याता ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 By this heat is explained

[2] It is stated that the method of establishing that smell is a natural quality may be analogously applied to heat as the characteristic of light (or fire) This analogy is to be regarded as holding good with respect to cold &c. as characteristics of water &c. U

---

[1] स्वाभाविक गन्ध पृथिव्या लक्षणमाह । पृथिव्या व्यवस्थितो ऽयोगान्ययोगाभ्यां परिच्छिन्न समानासमानजातीयव्यावर्तकतया गन्धो लक्षणमित्यर्थ भवति हि पृथिवी गन्धवत्येव पृथिव्येव गन्धवतीति तदेव समानजातीयेभ्यो जलादिभ्यो ऽसमानजातीयेभ्यो गुणादिपञ्चभ्यो व्यावर्तक स्वाभाविक पृथिव्या गन्ध इति व्यवस्थितम् ॥

[2] गन्धस्य स्वाभाविकत्वव्यवस्थापनप्रकारमुष्णतायां तेजोलक्षणेऽप्यतिदिशति । अबादिलक्षणे शैत्यादावप्ययमतिदेशो द्रष्टव्य ॥

SECOND DAILY LESSON

Natural and communicated qualities.

पुष्पवस्त्रयोः सति सन्निकर्षे गुणान्तराप्रादुर्भावो वस्त्रे गन्धाभावलिङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1 A flower and a garment being brought into contact the non appearance in the garment of another quality is a mark of the non-existence of smell in the garment.

[1] With the purpose of investigating smell &c., the characteristics of the elements, it is now established that smell &c. are natural and communicated. Colour, taste, smell and touch being natural where they are produced in the order of qualities proceeding from causes, become in such cases characteristics, but not in other cases. For the fragrance experienced in a breeze or the cold experienced on the surface of a stone or the warmth experienced in water is not a characteristic. Therefore it is said A flower and a garment being brought into contact or when a garment is brought into contact with a golden ketakí (*Pandanus Odoratissimus*) flower, the fragrance of the golden ketakí which is then experienced does not belong to the garment, for it is not produced from the garment in the order of a quality proceeding from a cause but is communicated through contiguity with the golden ketakí flower. For the non-existence of smell in the ketakí is not a mark of the non existence of smell in the garment. What then is the mark? It is said to be the non appearance of smell

[1] इदानीं भूतानां लक्षणानि गन्धादीनि परीक्षितुं गन्धादीनां स्वाभाविकत्वमौपाधिकत्वञ्च व्यवस्थापयति । रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा यत्र कारणगुणक्रमेणोत्पन्नास्तत्र स्वाभाविकाः सन्तो लक्षणतामुपयान्ति नान्यथा न हि समीरणे उपलभ्यमानं सौरभं शिलातले उपलभ्यमानं शैत्यं जले उपलभ्यमानमौष्ण्यं वा लक्षणं भवति तदेतदाह पुष्पवस्त्रयोरिति न हि कनककेतकीकुसुमसन्निकर्षे वाससि कनककेतकीसौरभमुपलभ्यमानं वाससः । न हि वाससः कारणगुणप्रक्रमेण तदुत्पन्नं किं तर्हि कनककेतकीसन्निधानादौपाधिकं न हि वस्त्रे गन्धाभावे केतकीगन्धाभावो लिङ्गम् । किं लिङ्गमत उक्तं गुणान्तराप्रादुर्भाव इति गुणान्तरस्य कारणगुणात् प्रादुर्भावः स्यादपि यदि हि वस्त्रे यो गन्ध उपलभ्यते स तस्य स्वाभाविकः स्यात्तदा तदवयवेषु तन्तुषु कनककेतकीसन्निकर्षात् पूर्वमेव वस्त्रे सोपलभ्येत न चैवमित्यर्थः तदा च विजातीयाभ्यामिति गन्धो न वायुमण्डल तदवयवगुणारब्धविशेषगुणत्वात् शैत्योष्णस्पर्शादिवत् ॥

from another attribute *i e* its non appearance or non production from a quality which is a cause For if the smell which is smelt in the garment be natural, it will be perceived before the contact with the ketakí in the threads which are its constituent parts This is not the case and therefore *the smell in question does not* inhere in the garment inasmuch as the particular quality is not produced by the qualities of the integrant parts, as is the case in cold and hot touch and the like U

Smell the characteristic of earth

व्यवस्थितः पृथिव्यां गन्धः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Smell is established as the mark of earth

[1] The characteristic of earth is stated to be its natural smell Smell *discriminated by its disjunction from and junction with other things and by its excluding things of similar and dissimilar* classes, is established as the characteristic of earth For the earth indeed has smell and only the earth has smell It is therefore established that smell which excludes earth from water and the next seven substances which are of the same class, and from quality and the four following categories which are of a different class, is natural to earth U

Analogously heat is the characteristic of light.

एतेनोष्णता व्याख्याता ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 *By this heat is explained*

[2] It is stated that the method of establishing that smell is a natural quality may be analogously applied to heat as the characteristic of light (or fire) This analogy is to be regarded as holding good with respect to cold &c. as characteristics of water &c. U

---

[1] स्वाभाविकं गन्धं पृथिव्या लक्षणमाह । पृथिव्यां व्यवस्थितो व्यतिरेकान्वयाभ्यां परिच्छिन्नः समानासमानजातीयव्यावर्त्तकतया गन्धो लक्षणमित्यर्थः भवति हि पृथिवी गन्धवत्येव पृथिव्येव गन्धवतीति तदेव समानजातीयेभ्यो जलादिभ्यो ऽसमानजातीयेभ्यो गुणादिपञ्चभ्यो व्यावर्त्तकः स्वाभाविकः पृथिव्या गन्ध इति व्यवस्थितम् ॥

[2] गन्धस्य स्वाभाविकत्वव्यवस्थापनप्रकारमुष्णतायां तेजोलक्षणेऽप्यतिदिशन्नाह । अबादिलक्षणे शैत्यादावप्ययमतिदेशो द्रष्टव्यः ॥

[1] It is stated that the characteristic of light [or fire] which consists of a hot feel is, like the characteristic of earth, not universally predicable of water, &c. V.

तेजस उष्णता ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4. Heat is [the characteristic] of light[2]

[2] The *characteristic of light* is examined. It is meant that natural heat is the characteristic of light Colour also, white and luminous, is implied *U.*

[3] Heat belongs to light alone not to any thing else Therefore the characteristic of light cannot be universally affirmed of any thing else. V.

Cold the characteristic of water

अप्सु शीतता ॥ ५ ॥

Aph. 5. Cold is [the characteristic] of water.

[4] *Natural cold is the characteristic of water. Therefore it* cannot be also universally affirmed of the surface of stone, sandal-wood, &c. By cold also its colour and taste are characterised, and viscidity and natural fluidity are also implied *U.*

[5] *Cold belongs to water, not to any thing else Therefore the* characteristic of light cannot be universally affirmed also of the surface of stone &c, inasmuch as its appearance there is communicated [*i e* not natural] V.

---

[1] पृथिवीलक्षणस्येव उष्णस्पर्शवत्त्वरूपतेजोलक्षणस्यापि न जलादावतिव्याप्तिरित्याह ॥

[2] तेजोलक्षणं परीक्षते । स्वाभाविक्युष्णता तेजोलक्षणमित्यर्थः रूपमेव शुक्लभास्वरमुपलक्ष्यते ॥

[3] तेजस एव उष्णता नान्येषामिति तेजोलक्षणस्य नातिव्याप्तिरिति भावः ॥

[4] स्वाभाविकी शीतता अपां लक्षणमित्यर्थः । तथा च शिलातलचन्दनखण्डादौ नातिव्याप्तिरिति भावः । शीततया रूपरसावप्युपलक्षणौ स्नेहं सांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वञ्चोपलक्षयति ॥

[5] अप्सु शीतता नान्यत्रेति न जललक्षणस्य शिलातलादावतिव्याप्तिस्तत्र शैत्यप्रतीतेरौपाधिकत्वादिति भावः

Fx stence of t me as a substance proved अपरस्मिन्नपर युगपत् चिर क्षिप्रमिति काललिङ्गानि ॥६॥

Aph 6 The notions of posteriority in relation to posteriority of simultaneity of slowness and quickness are marks of the exist ence of time

[1] The particle *iti* implying a kind of notion has relation to each individual word so that the meaning is that the conception of posteriority the conception of simultaneity the conception of slowness and the conception of quickness are marks of the existence of time By posteriority in relation to posteriority we are to understand also priority in relation to priority The sense is therefore as follows —if in relation to an old man between whose birth and the present time there is an interval of many revolutions of the sun we make a youth the term of relation a notion of priority is evolved and this must have some non co inherent cause In like manner if the old man be made the term of comparison with reference to the youth we shall find that a notion of posteriority is evolved Simultaneously means at the same time during the same revolutions of the sun or during the same time other than a revolution of the sun with reference to such judgments as 'They are born at the same time They stand at the same time They make something at the same time Revolutions of the sun which have not yet taken place are not thus determinant nor are those revolutions actually presented The substance then which determines such particular notions be cause otherwise they could not be produced is time U

---

[1] इतिकारो ज्ञानप्रकारपर प्रत्येकमभिसम्बध्यते तथा चापरमिति प्रत्ययो युगपदिति प्रत्यय चिरमिति प्रत्यय क्षिप्रमिति प्रत्यय काललिङ्गानीत्यर्थ । अपरस्मिन्नपरमित्यनेन परस्मिन् परमित्यपि द्रष्टव्य तेनायमर्थ बहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दनान्तरितजन्मनि स्थविरे युवानमवधि कृत्वा परत्वमुत्पद्यते तच्च परत्वमसमवायिकारणसापेक्षम । एव स्थविरमवधि कृत्वा यूनि अपरत्वोत्पत्तिर्निरूपणीया । युगपदिति युगपज्जायन्ते युगपत् तिष्ठन्ति युगपत कुर्वन्ति इत्यादिप्रत्ययानाञ्च एकस्मिन् काले एकस्या सूर्यगतौ एकस्मिन् सूर्यगत्यवच्छिन्नकाल इत्यर्थ न चाप्राप्ता एव सूर्यगतयो विशेषणतामनुभवन्ति न च स्वरूप प्रत्यासन्ना एव ता तस्मादेतादृशविशिष्टप्रत्ययान्यथानुपपत्त्या विशेषणप्रापक यद्द्रव्य स काल ॥

Time an eternal substance — द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Its substantiality and eternity are explained by air

[1] As the primary aerial atom is a substance because it possesses qualities, and eternal because it is a substance not inhering in any other substance (cp II 1, 12 & 13), so also is time U

[2] Time is, like the primary aerial atom a substance because a subject in which qualities exist, and eternal because it has no parts V

Unity of time — तत्त्वं भावेन ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Its unity is explained by existence

[3] The sense is that time, like existence, is one because the conception of quickness &c which are the marks of its existence, are in every case not particular, and because there exists no particular mark like that of the plurality of souls (cp II 1, 30) It may be objected, Time is manifold according to its division into moments, aggregates of two moments, hours, watches, days, days and nights, lunar fortnights, months, seasons half years, years, &c, how then can it be one? This is no valid objection, for the appear-

---

[1] यथा वायुपरमाणोर्गुणवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यत्वम् अद्रव्यद्रव्यत्वाच्च नित्यत्वं तथा कालस्यापीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] वायुपरमाणोरिव कालस्यापि गुणाश्रयत्वाद्द्रव्यत्वं निरवयवत्वान्नित्यत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[3] चिरादिप्रत्ययानां काललिङ्गानां सर्वत्राविशेषादनेकत्वे ऽप्यात्मनामिव विशेषलिङ्गाभावात् सत्तावदेकत्वं कालस्येत्यर्थः । नन्वेवं क्षणलवमुहूर्तयामदिवसाहोरात्रपक्षमासर्त्वयनसंवत्सरादिभेदेन भूयान् कालस्तत् कथमेक इति चेन्न भेदमानस्य उपाधिनिबन्धनत्वात् तथा एक एव स्फटिकमणिर्जपातापिञ्छाद्युपाध्युपरागेण भिन्न इव भासते तथैक एव कालः सूर्यस्पन्दाद्यवच्छेदभेदेन तत्तत्कार्यावच्छेदभेदेन च भिन्न इव भासते इत्यभ्युपगमात् ॥

ननु तथाप्यतीतानागतवर्तमानभेदेन कालत्रयमस्तु श्रूयते हि त्रैकाल्यमुपावर्तते त्रैकाल्यासिद्धेः इत्यादाविति चेन्न वस्तुतत्प्रागभावतत्प्रध्वंसावच्छेदेन त्रैकाल्यव्यवहारात् येन हि वस्तुना यः कालो ऽवच्छिद्यते स तस्य वर्तमानः यत्प्रागभावेन यः कालो ऽवच्छिद्यते स तस्य भविष्यत्कालः यत् प्रध्वंसेन यः कालो ऽवच्छिद्यते स तस्यातीतकालः तथा चावच्छेदकत्रित्वाधीनः कालत्रित्वव्यवहारः ॥

ance of a division is caused by an accident It is to be understood that as one and the same crystal, by accidentally reflecting the colour of a China rose tápinja (Xanthochymus Pictorius) &c, appears to be divided, so also time though one only appears, by reason of division marking the course of the sun &c, and the division marking the effects of such and such cause to be divided. It may be objected Yet time is threefold according to the division into, past future, and present, for it is said in the Veda, *The three times return The three times are unaccomplished,* &c This is no valid objection for the ordinary conception of time as threefold rests upon the distinguishing of things as antecedently non existent or potentially existent, and subsequently non existent *i e* as having ceased to exist For the time occupied by a thing existent is its present, the time occupied by its antecedent non existence is its future, and the time distinguished by its destruction or subsequent non-existence *is its past, so that the ordinary conception of time* as threefold rests upon trinal nature of the distinction U

Time a cause of non eternal substances

नित्येष्वभावादनित्येषु भावात् कारणे कालाख्येति ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 The term *time* is applicable to a cause inasmuch as it exists not in eternal and exists in not eternal things

[1] The term *time* is applicable to a cause, the cause of all things produced The reason is stated to be that it does not exist in things eternal and exists in things not eternal For since with regard to eternal substances such as ether, there is no such notion

[1] कारणे सर्वोत्पत्तिमत्कारणे काल इत्याख्या । हेतुमाह नित्येष्वभावात अनित्येषु भावादिति नित्येषु आकाशादिषु युगपज्जात चिर जात क्षिप्र जात इदानीं जात दिवा जात रात्रौ जात इत्यादिप्रत्ययस्याभावात् अनित्येषु घटपटादिषु यौगपद्यादिप्रत्ययाना भावात अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या कारण काल इत्यर्थ न केवल यौगपद्यादिप्रत्ययाना भावात् अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या कारण काल इत्यर्थ न केवल यौगपद्यादिप्रत्ययबलात कालस्य सर्वोत्पत्तिमन्निमित्तकारणत्वम अपि तु पुष्पफलादीना हैमन्तिकवासन्तिकप्रावृषेण्यादिसत्त्वाबलादेतदध्यवसेयम् ॥

as produced simultaneously produced slowly, produced quickly, produced now, produced during the day, produced at night whereas notions of simultaneity and the like do exist with regard to substances not eternal such as a water pot a piece of cloth &c., time is proved by an inclusive and an exclusive (i e by an affirmative and a negative) argument to be a cause It should be understood that time is the efficient cause of all things produced not only in virtue of such notions as simultaneity, but also in virtue of the terms hibernal vernal pluvial &c, as applied to flowers fruits, &c U

Existence of space proved

इत इदमिति यतस्तद्दिश्य लिङ्गम् ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 The mark pertaining[1] to space is that whence the knowledge arises that one thing is remote or not remote from another

[1] Pertaining to space—belonging to space causing us to infer the existence of space For that substance is space from which, with reference to two bodies in a determinate position and existing simultaneously, there springs the knowledge that one in which there is there the conjunction with more numerous conjunct objects, is more remote than one in which there is conjunction with less numerous conjunct object and that that body in which there are less numerous conjunctions of conjunct objects is more remote than that body in which there are more numerous conjunctions of conjunct objects For unless such a substance exist there is nothing to account for the two bodies having more or less numerous conjunctions with conjunct objects Unless this be accounted for there can exist no such thing as the conception of each body so characterised, and

[1] दिश इदं दिश्यं दिगनुमापकम् इतो ऽस्मात् संयुक्तसंयोगाश्रयादिदं बहुतरसंयुक्तसंयोगाधिकरणं परम् इतश्च संयुक्तसंयोगभूयस्त्वाधिकरणादिदं संयुक्तसंयोगाल्पीयस्त्वाधिकरणमपरमिति नियतदिग्देशयोः समानकालयोः पिण्डयोर्यतो द्रव्याद्भवति सा दिगित्यर्थः । न हि तादृशं द्रव्यमन्तरेण भूयसां संयुक्तसंयोगानामल्पीयसां वा पिण्डयोरध्यापकमन्यदस्ति न च तदुपनयमन्तरेण तत्तद्विशिष्टबुद्धिः न च तामन्तरेण परत्वापरत्वयोरुत्पत्तिः न च तदुत्पत्तिं विना तद्विशिष्टप्रत्ययव्यवहारौ ॥

without such a notion a highest and not highest [generic and specific] form of generality is impossible, but if that were impossible there would not be, as there actually are cognitions speculative and practical characterised by such generality U

[1] The words near or remote are to be supplied after one thing *from another* The mark *then of space is the conception of local* contiguity or remoteness according to which we know that one thing is far from or near to another Space therefore like time, is proved to exist inasmuch as it is that in which conjunction takes place and the not inherent cause of local propinquity or remoteness Space moreover, though one being divided according to difference of concomitants gives rise to the common distinction of east &c The quarter adjacent to this concomitant i e to the mountain behind which the sun rises is the east That which is remote from this mountain is the west The region adjacent to mount Meru is the north That which is remote from mount Meru *is the south* That which is adjacent to the mountain behind which the sun rises and remote from mount Meru is the south east. The region remote from Meru and remote from the mountain behind which the sun rises *is the south west* That which is adjacent to Meru and remote from the mountain behind which the sun rises is the north west That which is adjacent to Meru and adjacent to the mountain behind which the sun rises is the north-east. That in which the conjunction takes place which is produced by the conjunction of soul with requitative efficacy and

---

[1] इत इदमिति परमपर इति शेष तथा चास्मादिद दूरम अस्मादिदमन्तिकमिति दैशिकपरत्वबुद्धिर्यतस्तादृश दिग्लिङ्ग तथा च कालवत् दैशिकपरत्वापरत्वासमवायिकारणसयोगाश्रयतया दिक सिध्यति सा च एकापि उपाधिभेदात प्राच्यादिव्यवहार उपाधिश्च तदीयोदयगिरिसंनिहिता या दिक सा तदीयप्राची तदीयोदयगिरिव्यवहिता तु तदीयप्रतीची तदीयसुमेरुसंनिहिता या दिक सा तदीयोदीची एव सुमेरुव्यवहिता अवाची उदयगिरिसंनिहिता सुमेरुव्यवहिता आग्नेयी सुमेरुव्यवहितोदयगिरिव्यवहिता च नैरृती सुमेरुसंनिहिता उदयगिरिव्यवहिता च वायवी सुमेरुसंनिहिता उदयगिरिसंनिहिता च ऐशानी अदृष्टवदात्मसयोगजन्याग्निक्रियाजन्यसयोगाश्रय ऊर्ध्वम् पतनजन्यसयोगाश्रय अध ॥

by the rites of fire is above, that in which the conjunction caused by falling takes place is below V

Space an eternal substance

द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 The substantiality and eternity [of space] are explained by air

[1] It is a substance because possessed of attributes and eternal because it has no substratum [cf II 2 7] U

तत्त्वं भावेन ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Its unity [is explained] by existence

[2] The unity of space like *that of existence is proved by its* having a not particular mark and by the non existence in it of a particular mark From this its individual unity may be inferred [cf II 1 31] U

कार्यविशेषेण नानात्वम् ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Its diversity is [caused to be conceived] by the difference of its effects

[3] It is explained why, whereas space is one only there is the practical assurance of east, &c Its diversity, the common diverse conceptions of east &c, is caused by the difference of its effects, the accidental qualities of produced bodies But in reality space is one only V

आदित्यसंयोगाद्भूतपूर्वाद्भविष्यतो भूताच्च प्राची ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 [Space is regarded as] east because of a past future or present conjunction *of the sun*

---

[1] गुणवत्त्वाद् द्रव्यत्वम् अनाश्रितत्वाच्च नित्यत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] दिग्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्च सत्तावदेकत्वं तदनुविधानादेकपृथक्त्वम् ॥

[3] दिश एकत्वे ऽपि प्राच्यादिव्यवहारमुपपादयति । कार्यविशेषेण जन्यमूर्तरूपेण भिन्ना नानात्वं प्राच्यादिनानाव्यवहारः वस्तुत एकैव दिगित्यर्थः ॥

[1] The east [*prachi*] is so called because the sun moves [*anchati*] forward [*prak*] there Accordingly the space in which conjunction first takes place of the sun in its course from east to west of Meru whether such *conjunction be past future* or *present* is east Mention is here made of these three divisions of time, which rest upon the division of human observation One man has the practical assurance that this is the east because the conjunction of the sun in the orient first took place yesterday Another has *the notion of the east from* observing that the conjunction of the sun in the orient will first take place tomorrow Another has the notion of the east from observing that there is a present conjunction of the sun now taking place in that quarter U

तथा दक्षिणा प्रतीची उदीची च ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 So likewise [space is regarded as] south, west and north

[2] In like manner the practical assurance of the south arises from past future or present conjunction of the sun with the mountains &c in the southern quarter So also the notion of west and north may be analogously accounted for U

एतेन दिगन्तरालानि व्याख्यातानि ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 By this [similarly] the intermediate divisions of space are explained

[3] The notion of the south east quarter arises from combining

---

[1] प्राक् अस्या सविता अञ्चतीति प्राची तथा च यस्या दिशि मेरुप्रदक्षिणक्रमेण भ्रमत आदित्यस्य प्रथम सयोगो भूतपूर्वो भविष्यन् वा भवन् वा दिक् प्राची अत्र पुरुषाभिसन्धिभेदमाश्रित्य कालत्रयोपवर्णन भवति हि कस्यचित् पूर्वेद्यु प्रातरस्यां दिशि आदित्यसंयोग प्रथम वृत्त इतीय प्राचीति प्राचीव्यवहार कस्यचिदपरेद्युरस्या आदित्य सयोग प्रथम भावीत्यभिसन्धाय प्राचीव्यवहार कस्यचिदिदानीं अस्या आदित्यसयोगो भवतीत्यभिसन्धाय प्राचीव्यवहार ॥

[2] तद्वदेव दक्षिणदिग्वर्तिनगादिना सहादित्यसयोगाद्भूतपूर्वाद्भविष्यतो भूताद्वा दक्षिणाव्यवहार एव प्रतीच्युदीच्योरपि व्यवहार उन्नेय ॥

[3] प्राचीदक्षिणयोर्दिशोर्लक्षणसाङ्कर्येण दक्षिणपूर्वा दिगिति व्यवहार एव दक्षिण पश्चिमा पश्चिमोत्तरा उत्तरपूर्वेत्यूह्यम एते चादित्यसयोगा येन विभुना द्रव्येणोपनी यन्ते सा दिगिति कणादरहस्ये व्युत्पादित विस्तरत ॥

the characteristics of the eastern and southern quarters So also the south-west, and north-east may be inferred It is explained at length in the Kaṇáda rahasya that space is that by which, as an eternal substance, these and other conjunctions of the sun are manifested U

Nature of doubt.

सामान्यप्रत्यक्षाद्विशेषाप्रत्यक्षाद्विशेषस्मृतेश्च संशयः ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 Doubt [arises] from perception of a general, non perception of a particular, and remembrance of particularity

[1] Doubt arises from perception or knowledge of a general i e of a common property, from non perception or ignorance of a particular included in one of two alternatives, and from remembrance or knowledge of two alternatives. With reference to doubt therefore, the cause is knowledge of a common property, absence of certainty as to something comprised in one of two alternatives, and knowledge of two alternatives The word 'and implies the addition of knowledge of a non general property, and of opposed propositions, which are mentioned in the Nyáya Aphorisms V

दृष्टञ्च दृष्टवत् ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 That which is seen, and that which was formerly seen [are causes of doubt]

[2] Doubt is twofold that which has an external and that

[1] सामान्यस्य साधारणधर्मस्य प्रत्यक्षात् ज्ञानात् विशेषस्य एककोटिव्याप्यस्य अप्रत्यक्षात् अज्ञानात् विशेषस्य कोटिद्वयस्य स्मृतेर्ज्ञानात् संशयो भवतीति शेषः । तथा च संशयं प्रति साधारणधर्मज्ञानम् एककोटिव्याप्यनिश्चयाभावः कोटिद्वयज्ञानञ्च हेतुरित्यर्थः चकारात् न्यायसूत्रोक्तयोः असाधारणधर्मज्ञानप्रतिपत्तिवाक्यज्ञानयोः संग्रहः ॥

[2] द्विविधः संशयो बहिर्विषयकोऽन्तर्विषयकश्च बहिर्विषयकोऽपि दृश्यमानधर्मिकोऽदृश्यमानधर्मिकश्च तत्र दृश्यमानधर्मिको यथा ऊर्ध्वत्वविशिष्टस्य धर्मिणो दर्शनात् अयं स्थाणुः पुरुषो वेति अदृश्यमानधर्मिको यथा अरण्ये झाटाद्यन्तरिते गोगवयादिपिण्डे विषाणमात्रदर्शनात् अयं गौर्गवयो वेति वस्तुतस्तत्रापि विषाणधर्मिक एव सन्देहो विषाणमिदं गोसम्बन्धि गवयसम्बन्धि वेति विलक्षणामात्रात्तु द्वैविध्याभिधानम् अत सामान्यसंशयहेतुस्तदनेकत्र दृष्टं समानकम् एकत्र धर्मिणि वा दृष्टं संशयहेतुरित्यत्र प्रथमाविधामाह । दृष्टमूर्ध्वत्वं संशयहेतुः तेन दृष्टाभ्यां स्थाणुपुरुषाभ्यां तुल्यं वर्त्तते पुरोवर्त्तते ऊर्ध्वत्वं तद्दृष्टं संशयहेतुरित्यर्थः ॥

which has an internal object That again which has an external object relates to something of which the properties are perceived, or to something of which the properties are unperceived That which relates to something of which the properties are perceived, is such as when on seeing a determinate object and having *tallness as an attribute the doubt arises* whether the object be a post or a man. That which relates to an object the properties of which are not perceived is such as when on seeing merely the horns belonging to a cow gayal or other animal in a forest where it is concealed by the intervention of bushes &c the doubt arises whether it be a cow or a gayal But in the latter case the doubt really relates to the quality of the horn whether the horn belong to a cow or to a gayal and consequently the statement of this distinction is due merely to a refinement of language The general [i e common property] which is the cause of doubt gives rise to doubt either when observed in several objects or in one The first statement is therefore explained in this aphorism Height perceived is [in the former case] the cause of the doubt The height that is to say, which is perceived in a present object and which belonged equally to a post and to a man previously seen is the cause of the doubt U

यथादृष्टमयथादृष्टत्वाच्च ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 That which is perceived in a certain way [is a cause of doubt] because it is [at another time] perceived not in that way •

[1] That which is seen in a certain way, gives rise to doubt by reason of its being perceived not in that way For instance Chaitra being seen in a certain manner with hair is at another time seen not in that manner but without hair When in the course of

[1] अयथादृष्टत्वाद्धेतोर्यथादृष्टमपि संशायकं यथा चैत्रो यथादृष्टः केशवान् कालान्तरे अयथादृष्टः केशविनाकृतो दृष्ट इत्यर्थः । क्रमेण तत्रैव चैत्रे वस्त्रावृतमस्तके दृष्टे सति भवति संशयश्चैत्रोऽयं सकेशो निष्केशो वेति तत्र हि चैत्रस्य समानो धर्मः संशायकः स चैकत्रैव दृष्ट इत्यभिन्न एव धर्मिणि दृष्टः संशयहेतुः ॥

E

time Chaitra is seen with his head covered with his garments a doubt arises whether this Chaitra have hair or no In this case the being Chaitra is a common *property which gives rise to doubt* and this common property is seen in one object *The cause of the* doubt therefore *is seen in one undivided object* U

[1] It is stated that a property may exist under two alternative conditions in one object. For if Chaitra be seen with his head muffled up a doubt arises whether he have hair or no and the cause of this doubt is the knowledge of the notion Chaitra accompanied by the notion of hair or of the absence of hair V

विद्याऽविद्यातश्च संशयः ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 Doubt also [arises] *from knowledge and want of knowledge*

[2] Internal doubt is produced by knowledge and the want of knowledge. For instance an astronomer predicts truly and predicts untruly eclipses of the moon &c Accordingly a doubt arises in his mind as to his knowledge whether it be correct or not Or knowledge is sometimes science and sometimes not science wanting demonstration, and consequently a doubt arises with respect to something whether inasmuch as it is known it exists or not U

श्रोत्रग्रहणो योऽर्थः स शब्दः ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 The object which is apprehended by hearing is sound

[3] It is now established by means of a definition that sound is

[1] एकत्र कोटिद्वयसहचरित धर्म्ममाह । भवति हि प्रावृतशिरसि चैत्र अयं केशवान् निष्केशो वेत्यादिसंशयः तत्कारणञ्च केशतदभावसहचरितचैत्रत्वज्ञानम् ॥

[2] आन्तरसंशयो हि विद्याऽविद्याभ्यां भवति यथा मौहूर्त्तिकः सम्यगादिशति च न्द्रोपरागादि असम्यगपि तत्र स्वज्ञाने संशयः स्य जायते सम्यगादिष्टमसम्यग्वेति यद्वा ज्ञानं हि क्वचिद्विद्या क्वचिदविद्या अप्रमा भवति तथा च ज्ञायमानत्वात् सदिदमसद्वेति संशयो जायते ॥

[3] इदानीं शब्दं धर्मिणं लक्षणमुखेन व्यवस्थापयति । श्रोत्रेण गृह्यते ऽसौ श्रवणेन्द्रियजन्यलौकिकप्रत्यक्षविषय इत्यर्थः । शब्दत्वादेरपि तादृशत्वादर्थ इति जातिमान्

possessed of properties It is apprehended by hearing, that is, is an object of ordinary perception produced in the organ of hearing The notion of sound, being of the same kind, is an object, and is therefore a class The full definition, then, of sound is that it is a class included in the notion of a quality which exists as the object of common perception produced in the organ of hearing V

Doubt with respect to sound answered

तुल्यजातीयेष्वर्थान्तरभूतेषु विशेषस्य उभयथा दृष्टत्वात् ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 Since the particular [class of sound] is perceived both in things homogeneous and in things heterogeneous [a doubt arises with respect to it]

[1] 'A doubt arises with respect to sound' is to be supplied, and by 'sound' must also be understood the notion or class of sound and the notion of its being apprehended by the organ of hearing Since, then the *exclusion of particularity or difference of sound* is perceived in things homogeneous, i e in the twenty three qualities, and in things heterogeneous i e in substances and actions, sound gives rise to a doubt respecting itself, whether it be a quality, a *substance, or an action* U

[2] Some have maintained that, inasmuch as there *exist names* and notions of low and loud sounds, sound is a substance The refutation of this opinion is here commenced Since there is per-

इति तदर्थस्तथा च श्रवणेन्द्रियजन्यलौकिकप्रत्यक्षविषयवृत्तिगुणत्वव्याप्यजातिमत्त्वमेव शब्दलक्षणं पर्यवसितम् ॥

[1] शब्दे संशय इति शेष । शब्दे शब्दत्वं श्रोत्रग्राह्यत्वं चोपलभ्यते तत्र तुल्यजातीयेषु त्रयोविंशतौ गुणेषु अर्थान्तरभूतेषु द्रव्येषु कर्मसु च विशेषस्य व्यावृत्ते उभयथा उभयत्र दर्शनात् शब्दो किं गुणो द्रव्यं कर्म वेति संशयं जनयति ॥

[2] केचित्तु सूक्ष्मः शब्दः महाञ्छब्द इत्यादिव्यवहाराद्द्रव्यमेव [illegible] निराकर्तुमारभते । शब्दे गृह्यमाणस्य शब्दत्वादेर्विशेषस्य तुल्यजातीयेषु [illegible] त्रयोविंशतौ गुणेषु अर्थान्तरेषु द्रव्येषु कर्मसु च उभयथा उभयत्र [illegible] निश्चितेषु तदभाववत्तया निश्चितेषु च अदृष्टत्वात् शब्दो द्रव्यं न वेति [illegible] इति [illegible] तथा च निश्चितोभयकोटिमद्व्यावृत्तत्वरूपासाधारण्यस्य [illegible] तादृशसंशयं जनयतीति भावः ॥

ceived no particularity in the nature of sound apprehended in sound, both in the twenty-three things homogeneous, i. e. in the qualities, colour, &c., and in things heterogeneous i. e in substances and actions, which are distinguished by belonging to the class substance and other classes, 'a doubt arises'—for these words are to be supplied—whether sound be a substance or no. The knowledge of the existence in the nature of sound of particularity, in the form of exclusion from that of which both alternatives are distinguished, gives rise to such a doubt V.

एकद्रव्यत्वान्न द्रव्यम् ॥ २३ ॥

Aph. 23. Since it inheres in one substance only, [sound] is not a substance.

[1] That of which one substance is the substratum, inheres in one substance only Inasmuch, *therefore*, as no substance has only one cause of inhesion, sound, *since* it differs in properties from substance, is not a substance. U.

[2] The opinion that sound is a substance is here rejected Sound is not a substance, for it inheres in one substance, i e. resides in *one* only; whereas it is well known that no substance abides in one other substance *only*. V.

नापि कर्माचाक्षुषत्वात् ॥ २४ ॥

Aph. 24. Now, is it an action, for it is invisible.

[3] Sound is not an action, for the perception of which sound is the object is not visual, i.e is produced by some other external organ than the eye. The class sound, therefore, does not belong to

---

[1] एकं द्रव्यं समवायि यस्य तदेकद्रव्यं द्रव्यस्य किमप्येकद्रव्यसमवायिकारणकं न भवतीति द्रव्यवैधर्म्यान्नायं शब्दो द्रव्यमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] इदानीं शब्दस्य द्रव्यत्वं निरस्यति । शब्दो न द्रव्यम् एकद्रव्यत्वात् एकमात्राश्रितत्वात् न ह्येकमात्राश्रितत्वं किमपि द्रव्यं प्रसिद्धम् ॥

[3] प्रत्यक्षस्य शब्दविषयकस्याचाक्षुषत्वात् चक्षुर्भिन्नबहिरिन्द्रियजन्यत्वादित्यर्थः तथा च शब्दत्वं न कर्मवृत्तिचाक्षुषप्रत्यक्षावृत्तिजातित्वात् रसत्वादिवदिति भावः ॥

action, because like the class taste &c it exists as a class not included in things visually perceived U

गुणस्य सतोऽपवर्गः कर्मभिः साधर्म्यम् ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 The transiency of [sound] which is a quality, is a property common also to actions

[1] It may be objected that sound is an action, since like throwing upwards &c it comes rapidly to an end The answer is as follows —Transiency is rapid destruction This in the class quality is dependent, like qualities [such as pleasure and pain, and the like], on rapid occurrence of being and ceasing to be It is, therefore, only a property common also to actions, but not the whole essence of action Rapid destruction, which you advance as an argument, is found in other instances besides action, as is shown by the conception of duality by pleasure and pain, &c U

सतो लिङ्गाभावात् ॥ २६ ॥

Aph 26 Since there is no mark of [sound as] existing [before utterance, it does not so exist]

[2] Meeting the objection —Let it be allowed that sound is a quality, yet it is not a mark of the existence of ether, for it would justify the inference of the existence of ether, only if it were an effect of ether, whereas it is eternal its occasionally not being observed being due to the non existence of something to make it known, it is stated If sound existed previcusly to its

[1] ननु शब्दः कर्म आशुतरविनाशित्वात उत्क्षेपणादिवदिति चेदत्राह । अपवर्गः आशुनाशः स च गुणत्वे ऽपि द्वित्वादिवदाशुभाविनाशकसंनिपाताधीन इति कर्मभिः साधर्म्यमात्रमस्य न तु कर्मत्वमेव त्वदुक्तहेतोराशुतरविनाशित्वस्य द्वित्वज्ञानसुखदुःखादिभिरनैकान्तिकत्वमिति भावः ॥

[2] ननु सिध्यतु शब्दो गुणस्तथापि नाकाशकार्यलिङ्गम आकाशं हि तदा ऽनुमापयेत् यदि तस्य कार्यं स्यात किन्तु नित्य एवाय कदाचिदनुपलम्भस्तु व्यञ्जकाभावः प्रयुक्त इत्याशङ्क्याह । यदि हि उच्चारणात् प्रागूर्ध्वं शब्द सन् स्यात तदा सतो ऽस्य लिङ्ग प्रमाणान्तरं स्यात् न चाश्रवणदशायां शब्दसत्त्वे प्रमाणमस्ति तस्मात कार्य एवाय न व्यङ्ग्य इति ॥

utterance there would be a mark or another proof of it as an existing thing There is no proof of sound in the case of its not being heard It is not therefore manifested as pre existent U

[1] The doctrine of the Mimánsakas that sound is not produced but eternal, but that it is sometimes unperceived because there is nothing to make it known is rejected Because there is no mark of sound as existing means because there exists no proof establishing the eternity of sound V

नित्यवैधर्म्यात् ॥ २७ ॥

Aph 27 Since [sound] differs from the eternal [it does not exist previously to utterance]

[2] A difference is perceived between sound and the eternal For it is inferred by what is spoken that Chaitra Maitra and others exist even when concealed because Chaitra speaks but it is never inferred from that which is made known as a water pot and the like that that which makes known such as a lamp and the like exists. Therefore sound is produced but is not made known as previously existent U

[3] After the statement of the absence of a proof a proof of the contrary is stated. Sound is not eternal because it differs from the eternal i e because it ceases to be for that it ceases to be is established by the evidence of sense V

अनित्यश्चायं कारणात् ॥ २८ ॥

Aph 28 It is not eternal for it has a cause

---

[1] शब्दो न जन्यते किन्तु नित्य एव स कदाचिदप्रत्यक्षस्तु तस्य व्यञ्जकवैधुर्यादिति मीमांसकमतं निरस्यति । सतो नित्यस्य शब्दस्य लिङ्गाभावात् शब्दनित्यतासाधकप्रमाणाभावादिति फलितार्थः ॥

[2] नित्येन सहास्य शब्दस्य वैधर्म्यमुपलभ्यते यतश्चैत्रो वक्तीत्यत्रावृतोऽपि चैत्रमैत्रादिर्वचनेनानुमीयते न च व्यञ्जकः प्रदीपादिर्व्यङ्ग्येन घटादिना क्वचिदनुमीयते अतः स्माज्जन्य एवायं न व्यङ्ग्य इति भावः ॥

[3] साधकाभावमुक्त्वा बाधकमप्याह । नित्यवैधर्म्यात् विनाशित्वात् शब्दो न नित्यस्तच्चास्य प्रत्यक्षसिद्धत्वादिति भावः ॥

[1] Because its production from a cause is observed, is to be supplied For a sound is observed becoming manifest by the conjunction of a drum and drumstick, and the like It is, therefore, not eternal, because it is produced. Or 'for it has a cause' implies that the reason is that it possesses a cause U.

[2] Sound is not eternal, because it has a cause. For eternal things have no causes V

न चासिद्धं विकारात् ॥ २९ ॥

Aph 29 This is not unproved by change

[3] It must not be argued that there is no proof that sound has a cause, since, inasmuch as it is loud or soft, a change is perceived. For a loud or soft sound is perceived in consequence of the hardness or softness of the beating of a drum with a drumstick, and the like But the loudness &c of that which is manifested, is not dependent on the loudness &c of that which makes known. From its cause or change, therefore, it is inferred that it is produced, not that its existence is made known U

[4] That sound has a cause is not disproved by its change or existence as loud, soft, &c For in the absence of hardness or softness in the beating of a drum with a drumstick and the like, there

---

[1] कारणत उत्पत्तेर्दृष्टत्वादिति शेषः उपलभ्यते हि भेरीदण्डसंयोगादिभ्यः प्रादुर्भवन् शब्दः तथा चोत्पत्तिमत्त्वादनित्योऽयमिति यद्वा कारणत इति कारणवत्त्वहेतुमुपलक्षयति ॥

[2] शब्दोऽनित्यः कारणतः कारणवत्त्वादिति यावत् न हि नित्यानि कारणवन्ति भवन्ति इत्यर्थः ॥

[3] शब्दस्य कारणवत्त्वमसिद्धमिति न वाच्यं तीव्रमन्दादिभावेन विकारस्य दर्शनात् भेरीदण्डाभिघातस्य तीव्रतया तीव्रस्य मन्दतया मन्दस्य शब्दोपलम्भात् न ह्यभिव्यञ्जकतीव्रत्वाद्याधीनोऽभिव्यङ्ग्यतीव्रत्वादिः तथा च कारणतो विकारादनुमीयते जन्योऽयं न त्वभिव्यङ्ग्य इति ॥

[4] शब्दस्य कारणवत्त्वं नासिद्धं विकारात् तीव्रमन्दादिभावात् न हि भेरीदण्डाद्यभिघातस्य तीव्रमन्दादित्वाभावे शब्दस्य तीव्रमन्दादिभावः केनचिदुपलभ्यते नाप्यभिव्यञ्जकस्य तीव्रमन्दादिभावेन शब्दे तीव्रमन्दादिभावो भवितुमर्हति अतो भेरीदण्डाद्यभिघातादिकारणजन्यत्वं शब्दस्याकामेनापि वाच्यमिति नासिद्धिरिति भावः ॥

could not be observed to exist loudness or softness *of sound*. *It is* impossible that loudness, softness, &c. should exist in sound as a consequence of the loudness, softness, &c. of that which manifests it. It must therefore be admitted even by an opponent that sound is produced from a cause, this cause being the beating &c. of a drum with a drumstick, &c. V.

अभिव्यक्तौ दोषात् ॥ ३० ॥

Aph. 30. Since in its manifestation there would be a defect [sound is not manifested.]

[1] If sound were manifested, an unalterable relation of evolvent and evolute in things co-extensive and apprehended by the same sense would be wrongly conceived to exist. But no such unalterable relation is observed to exist among such objects. If this be not assented to, it will follow that when one letter (as *ka*) is manifested, all letters will be manifested The objection that an unalterable relation of that which manifests and that which is manifested is observed to exist between the existent, a man, and a Brahman, which are co-extensive, and are manifested according to their diverse natures, *places, and origins* is invalid *For they are* not co-extensive, for the extension of the human and the Bráhmanical, is not so great as that of the existent. U.

संयोगाद्विभागाच्च शब्दाच्च शब्दनिष्पत्तिः ॥ ३१ ॥

Aph. 31. Sound is produced by conjunction, disjunction and [other] sound.

[2] By conjunction—by the conjunction of a drum and drum-

[1] शब्दस्याभिव्यक्तौ समानदेशानां समानेन्द्रियग्राह्याणां प्रतिनियतव्यञ्जकव्यङ्ग्यत्वं दोषः स्यात्, न च तादृशानां प्रतिनियतव्यञ्जकव्यङ्ग्यत्वं क्वचिद्दृष्टम् अत्र यदि तदा न स्वीक्रियेत तदा ककाराभिव्यक्तौ सर्ववर्णाभिव्यक्तिप्रसङ्गः । ननु समानदेशानामपि सत्त्वमनुष्यत्वब्राह्मणत्वानां स्वरूपभेदसंस्थानयोनिव्यङ्ग्यानां प्रतिनियतव्यञ्जकव्यङ्ग्यत्वं दृष्टमेवेति चेन्न तेषां समानदेशत्वाभावात् न हि यावत् देशे सत्त्वस्य तावत्येव मनुष्यत्वस्य ब्राह्मणत्वस्य वा ॥

[2] संयोगात् भेरीदण्डादिसंयोगात् विभागात् वंशे पाट्यमाने तत्र संयोगस्तावद्वा

stick and the like By disjunction—in a bamboo when being split, for in this case conjunction is not the cause of the first sound for no such conjunction exists, and consequently disjunction of the two pieces of bamboo is the efficient cause and the non coinherent [or extrinsic or immaterial] cause is the disjunction between the piece split off and the ether When sound is produced at a distance on a lute &c. it is propagated by continual reproduction till arriving at that space in ether *which is limited by the outer ear it is perceived* Sound therefore is produced also from sound U

लिङ्गाच्चानित्य शब्द. ॥ ३२ ॥

Aph 32 Sound is not eternal because of its mark

[1] Articulate sound is not eternal because though constituting a class it is apprehended by the organ of hearing as in the case of a lute &c U

Objections of the Mimânsakas

द्वयोस्तु प्रवृत्त्योरभावात् ॥ ३३ ॥

Aph 33 But [*were sound quickly destructible*] the activities of two would not exist

[2] The objection of a Mimânsaka is stated Of two—of teacher and pupil —*the activities*—*the activity* of the teacher in teaching and of the pupil in learning—would not exist would follow to be non existent Since such expressions as The teacher teaches

---

द्यस्य शब्दस्य कारण तदभावात् तस्मात वंशदलद्वयविभागो निमित्तकारण दलाकाश विभागश्चासमवायिकारणम । यत्र च दूरे वीणादावुत्पन्न शब्द' तत्र सन्तानक्रमेण उत्पद्यमान शब्द कर्णशष्कुल्यवच्छिन्नमाकाशदेशमासादयन् गृह्यते तेन शब्दादपि शब्द निष्पत्तिरिति ॥

[1] वर्णात्मक शब्दोऽनित्य जातिमत्त्वे सति श्रोत्रग्राह्यत्वात वीणादिध्वनिवदित्यर्थ ॥

[2] मीमासक प्रत्यवतिष्टते । द्वयोर्गुरुशिष्ययो प्रवृत्त्यो गुरोरध्यापने प्रवृत्ति शिष्यस्य तु अध्ययने तयोरभावात् अभावप्रसङ्गात् गुरु शिष्यान् वेदमध्यापयति शिष्येभ्यो वेद ददाति इत्यादिवाक्यानामेकार्थत्वानुभवेन अध्यापन दानमेव तथा च शब्दस्याशु विनाशित्व तस्य दानप्रतिपद्योरसम्भवत्वात अध्यापने अध्ययने च प्रवृत्तिर्न स्यात अत शब्दस्यावश्य स्थैर्य स्वीकार्य नाशकानुपलब्धेश्च तन्नाशे प्रमाणाभावात तावत् काल स्थिरत्वेन क पश्चान्नाशयिष्यति इति न्यायेन नित्यतैव फलतीति भाव ॥

his pupils the Veda, and The teacher gives his pupils the Veda, are recogni-ed to be identical in sense, teaching is nothing else than giving As, therefore, if sound were rapidly destructible it would be impossible to give and receive it, there would exist no activity in relation to teaching and learning, the permanency of sound must, therefore, be admitted It also follows from the absence of a proof of destruction of sound, no destroying agent being observed. The eternity of sound is also established by the argument. It has so long existed, who shall destroy it after this? V.

प्रथमाशब्दात् ॥ ३४ ॥

Aph 34 From the word 'first' [it follows that sound is eternal.]

[1] The eternity of sound must be admitted, Inasmuch as in the Vedic text, "He thrice recited the first, and thrice the last," it is affirmed that the first and last texts recited at the adding of fuel to the sacred fire were thrice pronounced; for to pronounce them thrice would be impossible, unless sound were eternal. Therefore its eternity is established according to the argument previously employed V.

सम्प्रतिपत्तिभावाच्च ॥ ३५ ॥

Aph. 35. Also from the existence of recognition

[2] The permanence of sound necessarily follows from the existence of recognition or recollection. Such recognitions as that Maitra is reading the same verse as Chaitra read, or that this is the same letter *ka*, would be impossible unless sound were permanent. V.

---

[1] शब्दस्यावश्यं नित्यत्वमुपेयम् त्रिः प्रथमामन्वाह त्रिरुत्तमामन्वाह इति श्रुतेः प्रथमोत्तमयोः सामिधेन्योः त्रिरुच्चारणस्य विहितत्वात् न हि स्थैर्यमन्तरेण त्रिरुच्चारणं सम्भवतीति पूर्वोक्तन्यायेन नित्यतायाः सिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] शब्दस्यावश्यं स्थैर्यं सम्प्रतिपत्तेः प्रत्यभिज्ञाया भावात् सत्त्वात् यः श्लोकश्चैत्रेण पठितस्तमेव मैत्रः पठति स एवायं ककार इत्यादि प्रत्यभिज्ञाशब्दस्य स्थिरतामन्तरेणानुपपत्तेरिति भावः ॥

M mausaka s objec tions answered

सन्दिग्धा सति बहुत्वे ॥ ३६ ॥

Aph 36 A plurality existing [these arguments] are doubtful

[1] A plurality diversity and non permanency existing in the particular motions of the limbs in dancing and the like teaching learning and recognition are observed to exist in regard to them Therefore teaching &c the arguments or middle terms for the per manence of sound are doubtful, that is undistributed. For other-wise from such observations as He learns dancing He dances thrice Maitra is performing the same dance as was performed by Chaitra, permanence would be proved similarly of all these actions V

सख्याभाव. सामान्यत ॥ ३७ ॥

Aph 37 The existence [in sound] of number [results] from generality

[2] It may be said There are fifty letters texts of eight and texts of three syllables and the anushtubh metre of eight syllables How if letters be not eternal can they be infinite according to diversity of utterance? The reply is as follows The existence of number i e of the numbers fifty and the like results from univer sality from the letters *ka ga* &c existing as classes Though there be an infinity of the letters *ka* &c the things belonging to the class *ka ga* &c exist as fifty or three or eight just as substance quality &c exist as nine or twenty four in virtue of a division of that which is included in the class U

---

[1] नृत्यादीनामङ्गक्रियाविशेषाणा बहुत्वे ऽपि नानात्वे ऽपि अस्थैर्ये ऽपीति यावत सति अध्यापनाभ्यासप्रत्यभिज्ञाना दर्शनात अध्यापनाद्या स्थैर्ये साध्य सन्दिग्धा अनैकान्तिका नृत्यमधीते त्रिर्नृत्यते यदेव नृत्य चैत्रेण कृत मैत्रस्तदेव करोतीत्यनुभवस्य सर्व सिद्धत्वादित्यर्थ ॥

[2] ननु पञ्चाशद्वर्णा अष्टाक्षरो मन्त्र त्र्यक्षरो मन्त्र अष्टाक्षरो ऽनुष्टुबित्यादिसख्या कथ वर्णानामनित्यत्व उच्चारणभेदेनानन्त्यसम्भवादित्यत आह । सख्याया पञ्चाशदादिसख्याया भाव सद्भाव सामान्यत कत्वगत्वादिजातित इत्यर्थ ककारादीनामानन्त्ये ऽपि कत्वगत्वाद्यवच्छिन्नानपञ्चाशत्त्व त्रित्वमष्टत्व वा द्रव्यगुणादीनामान्तर्गणिकभेदेन नवचतुर्विंशतित्यादिवदित्यर्थ ॥

an axe and the like are employed Now, that in which this universal cognition resides and which employs for its instruments the olfactory and other organs is the soul U

सो ऽनपदेशः ॥ ३ ॥

Aph. 3 That is an invalid argument [which affirms that sensible cognition is an attribute either of the body or of the senses]

[1] In anticipation of the objection —' Let the body or the organs of sense be that in which cognition resides, for, these being both more manifestly related to cognition than their negations are why should we imagine any other cognising subject? For consciousness is an attribute of the body being like its colour, &c., one of its effects, and the same may be said to be the case with regard to the organs of sense as attributes —it is stated that this is an invalid argument, i. e. the appearance of an argument, inasmuch as the middle term being undistributed it is as uncertain that cognition is the effect of the body or the senses, as that knowledge of an object is generated by the lamp [by the light of which it is seen] U

[2] That—the argument to establish the existence of cognition in the body—is a fallacious argument—the mere appearance of an argument For a water pot a piece of cloth and the like do not in virtue of being effects of the body reside in the body It cannot be proved that cognition exists in the body, for this would be a violation of the argument just stated V

कारणाज्ञानात् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Because there is unconsciousness in the causes

---

[1] ननु शरीरमिन्द्रियाणि वा प्रसिद्धेराश्रयो ऽस्तु प्रसिद्धं प्रति तदुभयान्वयव्यतिरेकयो स्फुटतरत्वात् किं तदन्याश्रयकल्पनया तथाहि चैतन्यं शरीरगुणः तत्कार्यत्वात् तद्रूपादिवत एवमिन्द्रियगुणत्वेऽपि वाच्यमित्याशङ्काह । अपदेशो हेतु तदाभासो ऽनपदेश तथा च तत्कार्यत्वं प्रदीपजन्यादावनैकान्तिकत्वादनपदेश इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] स देहवृत्तित्वसाधको हेतुः अनपदेशः हेत्वाभासः देहकार्यत्वस्य घटपटादेः सत्त्वेन तत्र देहाश्रितत्वाभावात उक्तहेतोर्व्यभिचाराच प्रसिद्धेर्देहवृत्तित्वासिद्धिरित्यर्थः

[1] It is meant that cognition cannot reside in the body or in the organs of sense because of the unconsciousness or absence of consciousness in the causes or constituent parts, of the body, such as the hands, feet, &c. It is observed that the particular qualities of earth and the other substances are determined by the previous qualities of the cause of the substances In like manner if there existed consciousness in the causes of the body, it might possibly exist also in the body itself But this is not the case Should it be urged that consciousness must also exist in the constitutive portions of the body, it may be denied on the ground of the want of unanimity which would ensue, for unanimity is never observed between many sentient beings [whereas it is observed in the actions of the body] Moreover were the hand for instance cut off, there would be no recollection of that which was experienced at the amputation according to the maxim One does not remember that which is experienced by another Again when the body perished there would, as a consequence be no fruition of the results of injuries and the like done therein for Maitra does not experience the results of the evil done by Chaitra and actions would accordingly be lost, and there would come to pass events not determined by former acts *U*

कार्येषु ज्ञानात् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Because there would be consciousness in the effects.

[2] Anticipating the objection that consciousness exists in a mi

---

[1] शरीरकारणानां करचरणादीनां तदवयवानां वा अज्ञानात् ज्ञानशून्यत्वादित्यर्थः पृथिव्यादिविशेषगुणानां हि कारणगुणपूर्वकता दृष्टा तथा च शरीरकारणेषु यदि ज्ञानं स्यात्तदा शरीरे ऽपि सम्भाव्येत न चैवम् नन्वस्तु शरीरकारणेष्वपि चैतन्यमिति चेन्न ऐकमत्याभावप्रसङ्गात् न हि बहूनां चेतनानामैकमत्यं दृष्टम् कराद्युच्छेदेनानुभूतस्य कर च्छेदे ऽस्मरणप्रसङ्गात् ततो नान्यदृष्टं स्मरत्यन्य इति किञ्च शरीरनाशे तत्कृतहिंसादि फलानुपभोगप्रसङ्गात् न हि चैत्रेण कृतस्य पापस्य फलं मैत्रो भुङ्क्ते ततश्च कृतहानिरकृताभ्यागमश्च स्यात् ॥

[2] ननु शरीरकारणेषु सूक्ष्ममात्रया ज्ञानमस्ति शरीरे तु स्फुटमतो ना ऽकारणगुणपूर्वकता न चैकमत्यानुपपत्तिरित्याशङ्क्याह । यदि तु शरीरमूलकारणेषु परमाणुषु चैतन्यं

nute degree in the causes of the body, and is manifest in the body, and that there is not therefore the absence of a prior existence of the quality in the causes, nor the *impossibility* of unanimity, it is stated that if consciousness existed in the atoms which are the primary causes of the body, it would exist also *in the* water-pots and *like products or effects* which derive their origin from it; and also consciousness would exist in products such as water-pots and the like, *because the particular attributes of the* earth pervade all terrestrial existence But consciousness is not observed to exist in these products. U.

अज्ञानाच्च ॥ ६ ॥

Aph. 6. And because it is not known [that any minute degree of consciousness *exists in products of matter*]

' In anticipation of the objection that consciousness may exist in an inappreciable degree in water-pots and *other* material products, it is stated that inasmuch as it is not known by any kind of evidence, *there is no consciousness* in a water-jar and the like Otherwise it might have to be admitted that a hare has horns, if we are to allow what is unwarranted by any form of evidence. For by no kind of evidence is *it known* that *there exists consciousness in a* water-jar and the like U.

² 'It is not known,' means 'because there is no form of evidence conveying the notion of consciousness as existing in the various products.' The word 'and' implies that such an hypothesis is

स्यात् तदा तदारब्धेषु कार्येषु घटादिष्वपि स्यात् किञ्च पार्थिवविशेषगुणानां सर्वपार्थिववृत्तितया व्याप्तेः कार्येष्वपि घटादिषु चैतन्यं स्यान्न च तत्र चैतन्यमुपलभ्यते इत्यर्थः ॥

¹ ननु घटादावपि सूक्ष्ममात्रया चैतन्यमस्त्येवेत्याशङ्क्याह । सर्वैः प्रमाणैरज्ञानात् कुम्भादौ न चैतन्यमित्यर्थः सर्वप्रमाणागोचरस्याप्यभ्युपगमे शशविषाणादेरप्यभ्युपगमप्रसङ्गः न हि घटादौ चैतन्यं केनापि प्रमाणेन ज्ञायत इति ॥

² अज्ञानात् केनापि प्रमाणेन तत्तत्कार्यगतज्ञानस्याज्ञानाजननात् तथा च नियमाबाधकत्वाच्च तत्तत्कार्येषु ज्ञानमित्यर्थः चकारो गौरवं समुच्चिनोति तथा च नानावयवेषु नानाचैतन्यकल्पनापेक्षया चैतन्याधारतया एकं द्रव्यान्तरमेव कल्पयितुमुचितमितिभावः ॥

unnecessary It is more fitting to conceive some one other substance as the subject of consciousness than to imagine a varied consciousness existing in various portions of matter V

अन्यदेव हेतुरित्यनपदेशः ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 The means of proof is something else [than has been supposed] —this is not a valid argument

[1] It may be urged It has been affirmed that a ruling soul is inferred from the organ of hearing and other instruments This *is not a legitimate inference, for the auditory and other organs are* neither identical with, nor produced by, the soul , and unless one of these alternatives be admitted there is no proof of any inseparable co existence of these organs and the soul , and unless there be such inseparable co existence there can be no valid inference of this kind. *To this it is replied that the means of proof can but be something* else than that which is to be proved It cannot be identical with that which has to be proved for were it so it would follow that there would be no difference between the means of proof and the thing proved A means of proof constituted by identity with that *which is to be proved, is no means of proof—is invalid as an argument* U

अर्थान्तरं ह्यर्थान्तरस्यानपदेशः ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 One thing cannot be an argument [of the existence of another thing with which it is wholly unconnected]

[2] It might be asked by an objector how quality not produced

[1] ननु श्रोत्रादिभिः करणैरधिष्ठाता अनुमीयते इत्युक्तं तदयुक्तं न हि श्रोत्रादिभिरात्मनस्तादात्म्यं तदुत्पत्तिर्वा न च ताभ्यामन्तरेणाविनाभावसिद्धिः न चाविनाभावमन्तरेणानुमितिरित्यत आह । हेतुः साध्यादन्य एव भवति न तु साध्यात्मा साध्याविशेषप्रसङ्गात् तस्मात्तादात्म्यघटितो हेतुरहेतुरनपदेश इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु साध्यादनुत्पन्नस्य गुणत्वस्य कथमनुमापकत्वम् तथा सति धूमादिना वह्न्यादेरिव रासभादेरप्यनुमानापत्तेरित्यत आह । हि हेतौ यतो ऽर्थान्तरं वस्त्वन्तरम् अर्थान्तरस्य ननु वस्त्वन्तरस्य अनपदेशः अहेतुः रासभादेर्व्याप्तिशून्यो हि धूमादिः रासभादौ साध्ये हेत्वाभासः वह्न्यादौ तद्व्याप्यत्वस्य तत्र सत्त्वात् प्रकृते तु व्याप्तिसत्त्वाद्गमकत्वमिति भावः ॥

by that which is to be proved can warrant any *inference*, for were this the case smoke &c, might prove the existence of an ass &c, or as well as that *of fire* It is therefore stated that one thing or kind of substance, cannot be an argument for the existence of another thing or another kind of substance *Thus smoke &c if the* existence of ass is to be *proved, would* be fallaciously adduced as a means *of proof* being void of invariable concomitance with asses, &c But with reference to fire &c it would not be so, for in that case there would exist a concomitance In the *present case there* must be a *concomitance there is not merely* an accidental relation V

संयोगिसमवाय्येकार्थसमवायिविरोधि च ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 The conjunct the inherent the co-inherent in one thing, and the contradictory [are means of proof]

[1] Such form of proof as The body has skin because of *its corporeality, is that of conjunction* For skin is described as a natural integument of matter capable of growth and decay, and is neither a cause nor an effect of the body, but merely produced together with the body and invariably conjoined with it In like manner the form of proof from inhesion is such as Ether possesses extension, because of its substantiality, like a water pot, &c Here extension which has to be proved is established by substantiality a property essential to ether Or another example would be —The divisibility of extension must somewhere cease, *therefore* the atomic, as a degree of extension is proved, whence it is inferred that atoms exist in which the atomic inheres The inference

---

[1] शरीरं त्वग्वत् शरीरत्वादित्ययं हेतुः संयोगी वृद्धिक्षयवद्द्रव्यसङ्घातरूपा हि त्वगित्युच्यते तच्च न शरीरस्य कार्यं कारणं वा किन्तु सहोत्पत्तिकमात्रं नियतसंयोगवत्। एवं समवायि यथाकाशं परिमाणवद्द्रव्यत्वात् घटादिवदिति अत्र परिमाणं साध्यं द्रव्यत्वेनाकाशसमवायिना धर्मेण साध्यते यद्वा परिमाणतारतम्यं क्वचिद्विश्रान्तमित्यनेनाणुत्वं परिमाणविशेषं सिद्धं तेन तदाश्रयः परमाणुरनुमीयते शब्दादिना त्वाकाशस्य ज्ञानादिना त्वात्मनोऽनुमानं कार्येण कारणानुमानमिति नोदाहृतम्॥

from sound of ether, and from knowledge &c. of soul is not given as an inference of cause from effect U

[1] The conjunct means the means of proof connected with conjunction Is a means of the proof is to be supplied after each term of the aphorism. That which is connected by conjunction i e the mark of the existence of that which is dependent on conjunction *is included in the conjunction* Otherwise how could there be such inferences as that in a particular place there are charioteers because there are chariots excellently driven there? Here the relation determining the conclusion is the connection by conjunction with the conjunct In like manner the inherent is a mark of the existence of *that in which it inheres* *Else how in the* case of seeing a mere portion of an animal &c could it be inferred from such determinate part that the whole is an animal &c? Nor can it be argued that there being in the case of conjunction of the sight with that portion a conjunction with the whole object it is difficult to prove that such an inference as this is not *a mere perception* *for it is possible only where there is a desire* to infer Since therefore a chariot and the like are not effects or products of a charioteer &c and are different from the charioteer &c. but invariably accompanied by the charioteer &c the being invariably accompanied by an object i e the being inferrible from it is not astricted to the case of identity with or production by that object. V

[1] संयोगि संयोगानुयोगि लिङ्गमिति सर्वत्रैव । तथा च संयोगानुयोगि संयोगप्रतियोगिनो लिङ्गं व्याप्यं कथमन्यथा अयं देशः सारथिमान् शीलवद्गतिमद्रथादित्याद्यनुमितिः साध्यतावच्छेदकसम्बन्धश्चात्र स्वसंयुक्तसंयोगः एवं समवाय्यपि समवेतस्य लिङ्गं कथमन्यथा पश्वाद्यवयवमात्रदर्शनदशायां विशिष्टावयवेनावयविनः पश्वादेरनुमितिः न चावयवचक्षुःसंयोगदशायामवयविन्यपि संयोगसत्त्वात् तस्यापि प्रत्यक्षं दुर्वारमिति वाच्यं तथापि सिषाधयिषया तादृशानुमानसम्भवात् तथा सारथ्यादिभिन्नस्य सारथ्याद्यकार्यस्य च रथादेः सारथ्यादिव्याप्यत्वात् व्याप्यत्वं न तादात्म्यतदुत्पत्तिनियतमिति भावः ॥

कार्यं कार्यान्तरस्य ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 One effect is [a mark *of the existence*] of another effect

[1] An effect colour for instance, is a mark of the *existence of* another effect, such as touch It is implied also that that which is not an effect, the unity of ether, is a mark of the *existence of* the individual unity of ether which is not an effect, and so *in the case* of infinite magnitude U

[2] An effect or product of the earth such as smell, is a mark of the existence—*for these words are to be supplied*—of another effect such as taste Co inhesion in one object is juxtaposition constituted by in coexistence In like manner invariable taste &c should be regarded as a mark of the existence of invariable colour &c Since, therefore, there is in smell &c, an invariable concomitance with taste, &c which is not indifferent from or produced by smell it is proved that invariable concomitance is not astricted to the cases of identity and causality V

विरोध्यभूतं भूतस्य ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11 A non-existent contradictory [is a mark] of the existent

[3] The contradictory mark of co-existence or middle term is exemplified Rain which has not fallen, is a mark of there having been no conjunction of air and clouds In like manner the recita-

---

[1] कार्यं रूपं कार्यान्तरस्य स्पर्शस्य लिङ्गम । उपलक्षणञ्चैतत अकार्यमप्याकाशैकत्वम् आकाशैकपृथक्त्वे लिङ्गम् एव परममहत्त्व ॥

[2] कार्यं पृथिव्या कार्यं गन्धादिकं कार्यान्तरस्य रसादेर्लिङ्गमिति शेष' एकार्थसमवाय समवायघटितसामानाधिकरण्यम एव नित्यरसादिकमपि नित्यरूपादेर्लिङ्ग द्रष्टव्यम तथा च गन्धादे रसाद्यभेदस्य रसादिजन्यत्वस्य वा अभावात व्याप्तेस्तदुभयनैयत्य बाधितमेवेति भाव ॥

[3] विरोधिलिङ्गमुदाहरति । अभूतं वर्षं भूतस्य वाय्वभ्रसंयोगस्य लिङ्गमेव स्फोटादे विरोधी मन्त्रपाठ तथा चाभूतमनुत्पन्न स्फोटादि भूतस्य मन्त्रपाठस्य लिङ्गम ॥

tion of a sacred text is preventive of a tumour &c and accordingly there not having existed a tumour &c is a mark of there having been a *recitation of a sacred text* U

¹ It is exemplified how the contradictory may be employed as a *middle term* The *non existent* or *non adjacent or in other words* non adjacency of the contradictory is a mark—for these words are to be supplied—of the existent of that which has come into or remains in existence The illation assumes the following form This wood is combustible when conjoined with fire because gems &c (said to have the power of extinguishing fire) do not co exist as in *the case of other substances reduced to ashes* This *district contains* unintimidated snakes for though there are snakes there are no ichneumons as there are in certain other countries where there are venomous serpents V

भूतमभूतस्य ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 That which has been [is a mark] of that which has not been

² Another contradictory argument is exemplified A tumour &c which has been is a mark of the recitation of a sacred text which has not been so also conjunction which has existed between wind and clouds is a mark that there has not been rain there having been a fire is a mark that there has not been extinction of fire by means of gems &c Similar instances may be inferred U

---

¹ विरोधिनो व्याप्यत्वमुदाहरति । अभूतम असन्निहित विरोधि विरोध्यसंनिधानमिति यावत भूतस्य जातस्य स्थितस्य वा विरोधिनो लिङ्गमिति शेष अयमनुमानप्रकार इद काष्ठ दाहवत् वह्निसंयुक्तत्वे सति मण्याद्यसंनिधानात भस्मीभूतकाष्ठान्तरवत अय देशो निर्भयाहिमान् अहिमत्त्वे सति नकुलशून्यत्वात तादृशनिश्चितदेशान्तरवदित्यर्थ ॥

² विरोधिलिङ्गस्योदाहरणान्तरमाह । भूत स्फोटादिकम अभूतस्य मन्त्रपाठस्य लिङ्गम एवभूतो वाय्वभ्रसयोगो अभूतस्य वर्षस्य लिङ्गम एवभूतो दाहो अभूतस्य मण्यादिसमवधानस्य लिङ्गमेवमन्यदप्यूह्यम ॥

[1] That which has been that which has come into or remains in existence is a mark that there has not been its contradictory, a mark, in other words, of the non adjacency of its opposite For examples This wood is not co existent with gems &c, for it burns This district has no ichneumons for it has unintimidated snakes, and so forth V

भूतो भूतस्य ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 That which has been [is a mark of something repugnant] which has been.

[2] Another mark of concomitance or middle term is exemplified There is sometimes inference from an existing opposite to an existing opposite as when on seeing a snake swelling with anger it is inferred that there is an ichneumon behind a bush In this case the snake excited is in existence and the ichneumon hidden by the bush is in existence There is therefore an existent object as the mark of an existent object On the other hand rain cannot exist at the same time as conjunction of clouds and wind nor can tumours &c co-exist with recitation of sacred texts U

प्रसिद्धिपूर्वकत्वादपदेशस्य ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 [These forms of inference are valid] because the mark is preceded by knowledge [of invariable concomitance]

[3] Knowledge is recollection of invariable concomitance (vyâpti) The mark of this co existence is the middle term There is there

---

[1] भूतमुत्पन्नं स्थितं वा अभूतस्य विरोधिनो विरोध्यसन्निधानस्य लिङ्गमित्यर्थः यथा न काष्ठा मण्याद्यसन्निहिता दाहकत्वात् अयं देशो नकुलशून्यः भीतिरहिताहिमत्त्वात् ॥

[2] लिङ्गान्तरमुदाहरति । विद्यमानेनैव विरोधिना विद्यमानस्यैव विरोधिनः क्वचिदनुमानं यथा विस्फूर्जन्तमहिं दृष्ट्वा झाटान्तरितस्य नकुलस्य अत्र हि विस्फूर्जदहिर्भूतो विद्यमानो नकुलोऽपि विद्यमान इति भवति भूतो भूतस्य लिङ्गमित्यर्थः यथा अभ्रसंयोगपवनयोस्तु नैकस्मिन् काले विद्यमानता न वा स्फोटमन्त्रपाठयोरिति ॥

[3] प्रसिद्धिः स्मर्यमाणा व्याप्तिः अपदेशो हेतुवचनं तेन स्मर्यमाणव्याप्तिविशिष्टो हेतुर्हेत्ववयवेनोपनयावयवेन वोच्यते इति भवति प्रसिद्धिपूर्वकोऽपदेश इति तथा च

fore expressed by that member of the syllogism which states the argument or by the subsumption a middle term characterised by invariable concomitance mentally resuscitated Therefore the argument as has been stated has for its antecedent some general knowledge In the above instanced inference then of the soul as a governing element from its instruments such as the organ of hearing and of the soul as a substratum from qualities such as knowledge there is an invariable concomitance, but when you attempted to prove by the mark of its being an effect of the body, that knowledge is a quality of the body there was no invariable concomitance

It may be asked What is this invariable concomitance? It is not merely a relation of coextension for coextensiveness or incompatibility with absence of that which is to be predicated in the conclusion is not recognised where only positive conditions of concomitance are found for unsusceptibility of incompatibility with that which is to be so predicated may be such an exclusively positive condition of concomitance Smoke also contains in itself incompatibility with various predications in the conclusion Nor is it the relation of inseparability for that is either non existence of the mark or middle term in the absence of that which is to be proved [viz the major which has to be proved of the minor], or existence of the mark argued from the existence of that which is to be predicated in the conclusion And if you say that a definite relation of condition and conditioned positive or negative may be asserted between smoke and an ass because smoke sometimes does not exist where an ass does not exist and exists where an ass exists we deny it for such would be the case only if we found any determinate relation

---

श्रोत्रादिना करणेनाधिष्ठातु ज्ञानादिना च गुणेन तदाश्रयस्यात्मनो यदनुमानमुक्तं तत्र सर्वत्र व्याप्तिरस्ति त्वया तु शरीरकार्यत्वेन हेतुना ज्ञानस्य शरीरगुणत्वं साधितं तत्र न व्याप्तिरिति भाव ननु केयं व्याप्तिर्न तावदव्यभिचारितसम्बन्ध अव्यभिचारश्च सा ध्यात्यन्ताभावसामानाधिकरण्यानधिकरणत्वस्य केवलान्वयिन्यप्रसिद्धे साध्यानधिकर

Nor is it the relation of totality or integrity If you say that invariable concomitance is the connection of the middle term with the whole of the major term such connection does not exist in the case of smoke &c, where the concomitant objects are not co-extensive [for though fire exists wherever smoke exists, smoke is said not always to exist where fire exists not being found in red hot iron &c] Let it be connection of the whole middle term with the major, but this is impossible for there does not exist in the whole of the middle term connection with the individuals denoted by major [e g all fire does not exist in a hearth in a cattle station a mountain &c, but exists in the whole aggregate of places where smoke exists, as also elsewhere] Let it be connection of the whole major with the whole middle term This also it cannot be, for it is impossible that there should be connection between each extensive part of the middle and each extensive part of the major In the case of the concomitant objects not being co extensive the definition that invariable concomitance is connection by totality would be unduly restricted

---

व्याप्यानधिकरणत्वस्यापि केवलान्वयिन्यसम्भवात् धूमादेरपि यत्किञ्चित्साध्यानधिकरणाधि करणत्वात् । नाप्यविनाभावः । स हि साध्यं विना ऽभावो वा हेतोः अविना साध्याभावे सति भावो वा धूमस्यापि क्वचिद्रासभाभावे ऽभावात् रासभसत्त्वे सत्त्वाच्च नियतव्यतिरेको नियतश्चान्वयो विवक्षित इति चेत् न नियमस्यैव निरूप्यमाणत्वात् नापि कार्त्स्न्येन सम्बन्धः स यदि कृत्स्नस्य साध्यस्य साधनसम्बन्धः स विषमव्याप्ते धूमादावपि नास्ति अथ कृत्स्नस्य साधनस्य साध्यसम्बन्धः सो ऽप्येकस्य साध्यस्य कृत्स्नसाधने सम्बन्धाभावा दनुपपन्नः अथ कृत्स्नस्य साध्यस्य कृत्स्नेन साधनेन सम्बन्धः एतदप्ययुक्तं न हि कृत्स्नेन साधनेन कृत्स्नस्य साध्यस्य क्वचिदपि सम्बन्धः सम्भवति प्रत्येकमेव साध्यसाधनयोः स- म्बन्धात् विषमव्याप्ते चाव्याप्तेः नापि स्वाभाविकः सम्बन्धः स्वभावो हि स्वस्य भवो वा स्वयमेव भावो वा तत्र तज्जन्यत्वस्वजन्यत्वार्थे तदा समवायसंयोगयो व्यापत्वा व्याप्तेः तदाश्रितत्वस्वेतराश्रितत्वार्थे तदापि समवाये ऽव्याप्तिः न हि समवायः क्वचि दाश्रितः संयोगस्यापि हेतुधर्मधूमत्वाद्यनाश्रितत्वात् हेतुधर्मधूमत्वाद्यजन्यत्वाच्च ना प्यनौपाधिकः सम्बन्धः उपाधेरेव दुर्वचत्वात् सुवचत्वे ऽपि दुर्ग्रहत्वात् सुग्रहत्वे ऽप्यन्यो न्याश्रयत्वात् साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकत्वादेर्व्याप्तिग्रहाधीनग्रहत्वात् नापि सम्बन्धमात्रं व्याप्तिः व्यभिचारिसम्बन्धस्यापि देशविशेषकालविशेषगर्भतया व्याप्तिरूप त्वे ऽपि तज्ज्ञानस्यानुमित्यहेतुत्वात् अनुमितिकारणीभूतज्ञानविषयव्याप्तेरेव निरूप यितुमुचितत्वात् नापि साधनवन्निष्ठात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगिसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यं व्या प्तिः वह्नेरपि धूमवन्निष्ठात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगित्वात् न हि धूमवति महानसे पर्वतीयव-

Nor is it natural conjunction For the nature of a thing is the thing's proper mode of being or its being in itself If by the secondary affix be meant its *being produced in such and such a* place, our definition will be too narrow to apply to invariable concomitance constituted by in-coexistence If by the secondary affix be meant co inherence in any thing, the definition will be too narrow to include co inhesion, for co-inhesion is not co inherent with anything else For conjunction neither inheres in, nor is produced by, smokiness the character of the middle term Nor is it connection as a general predicate The general predicate is difficult to explain and were it easy, would be difficult to understand And were it easy to conceive yet there would be a reciprocal inherence or logical see-saw, being based on an induction of what did *not pervade the middle term*,, though pervading the major Invariable concomitance is not merely connection. For since fallacious connection includes particular place and *particular time*, knowledge of such connection even were it an invariable concomitance, would be useless in illation, for we should prescribe only such invariable concomitance as is the object of cognition causative of illation

---

वृत्तेर्नात्यन्ताभावः इदं संयोगि द्रव्यत्वादित्यादौ संयोगात्यन्ताभावस्य साधनसमानाधिकरणत्वादव्यापकताप्रसङ्गात् प्रतियोगिविरुद्धस्वसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावाप्रतियोगिसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यं व्याप्तिः संयोगात्यन्ताभावस्यापि प्रतियोगिविरुद्धत्वाभावादिति चेन्न संयोगात्यन्ताभावस्यापि प्रतियोगिविरुद्धत्वात् अन्यथा अवच्छेदभेदकल्पनावैयर्थ्यात् न हि कृतकत्वानित्यत्वयोर्वृत्त्यर्थकवच्छेदभेदः कल्प्यते नापि साध्यवैयधिकरण्यानधिकरणत्वं केवलान्वयिनि साध्यवैयधिकरण्याप्रसिद्धेः साध्यानधिकरणाधिकरणत्वं हि तत् नापि यत्सम्बन्धितावच्छेदकरूपवत्त्वं यस्य तस्य वा व्याप्तिः वह्नित्वस्यापि धूमसम्बन्धितावच्छेदकत्वात् अधिकदेशवृत्तितया तत्र तथेति चेत् व्यापकतावच्छेदकस्याधिकदेशवृत्तेरभ्युपगमात् धूमत्वस्यापि गगनतलावलम्बिधूमवृत्तितयाधिकदेशवृत्तित्वात् अत एव एतद्वारणाय विशेषणमिति चेत् तर्हि यद्व्याप्यतावच्छेदकं तदेव सम्बन्धितावच्छेदकत्वेनानुमतं तथा चात्माश्रयः। एवञ्च यत् सामानाधिकरण्यावच्छेदकरूपवत्त्वं यस्य तस्य सा व्याप्तिरित्युक्तदोषाक्रान्तमिति चेत् अत्रोच्यते अनौपाधिकः सम्बन्धो व्याप्तिः अनौपाधिकत्वन्तु यावत् स्वव्यभिचारिव्यभिचारिसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यं यावत्स्वसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगिप्रतियोगिकात्यन्ताभावसमानाधिकरणसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यं वा यावत् साधनाव्यापकाव्याप्यसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्यमिति निरुक्तिद्वयार्थः यावत्साध्यव्यापकव्यापकत्वं वा बहुव्रीहिणा दुर्ग्रहमिदमिति चेत् अत एव भूयोदर्शनापेक्षा तर्कापेक्षा

Nor is invariable concomitance in coexistence of the major which is absent only when there is absolute non existence of that of which the middle is predicated, fire for example being absent where there is an absolute non existence of things smoky for volcanic fire can but be non existent in a kitchen hearth though smoky For in such an instance as This is conjunct for it is a substance the definition would be unduly restricted for otherwise absence of conjunction would reside in the same objects as the middle term conjunction It may be said that invariable concomitance is in-coexistence of the predicate of the conclusion absent where there is absolute non existence of an appropriate subject repugnant to such absent predicate absolute non-existence of conjunction not being repugnant to such absent predicate. This we deny for absolute non-existence of conjunction is repugnant to such absent predicate for otherwise it will be useless to imagine any kind of distinctive attribute, as it is not imagined that there is any distinctive attribute discriminating between the produced and the non-eternal

---

च । यद्वा साधनसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगिसाध्यसामानाधिकरण्य व्याप्ति
अत्यन्ताभावश्च वह्नित्वादिसामान्यावच्छिन्नप्रतियोगिताको विवक्षित तेन महानसीयधूमे
पर्वतीयवह्न्यत्यन्ताभावसामानाधिकरण्ये ऽपि न दोष धूमवति वह्निर्नास्तीति प्रतीतेर
नुदयात द्रव्यत्वन्तु संयोगित्वात्यन्ताभावासमानाधिकरणमेव न हि भवति द्रव्य न सं
योगीति प्रतीति संयोगाना प्रत्येकमव्याप्यवृत्तित्वे ऽपि संयोगित्वसामान्यस्य व्याप्यवृत्ति
त्वात तस्य च व्यापकत्वात्। नन्वनौपाधिकत्वमुपाधिविरह उपाधिश्च दुर्निर्वचनीय
इति चेन्न साध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकस्योपाधित्वात तदुक्त साधने सोपाधि
साध्ये निरुपाधिरुपाधि । ननु केवलसाध्यव्यापकोपाधिर्व्यापकत्वमेतन्न तथा वायु
प्रत्यक्ष प्रत्यक्षस्पर्शाश्रयत्वादित्यत्रोद्भूतरूपवत्त्वम स श्यामो मित्रातनयत्वादित्यत्र
शाकपाकजत्वम न ह्युद्भूतरूपवत्त्व प्रत्यक्षव्यापकम आत्मनि गुणकर्मादौ च प्रत्यक्षे तद
भावात नापि शाकपाकजत्व श्यामत्वव्यापक काकोकिलजलदजम्बूफलादौ श्यामे तद
भावादिति चेन्न पर्यवसितसाध्यव्यापकत्वे सति साधनाव्यापकत्वस्य तथा विवक्षितत्वात्
पर्यवसितत्वञ्च साध्य यद्धर्मावच्छेदेनोपाधेर्व्यापकत्वमभग्न तद्धर्मावच्छिन्नम प्रकृते बहिर्द्र
व्यत्वावच्छेदेन प्रत्यक्षस्योद्भूतरूपवत्त्वं व्यापकम् अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्या तदुक्तम् श्रीत्यादि
धनश्यामत्वावच्छिन्न साध्य प्रति चरकसुश्रुतादौ शाकपाकजत्वस्य व्यापकत्वावधार
णादेवमन्यत्राप्यूह्यम् । ननु नायमुपाधिपदार्थ यद्धर्मो ऽन्यत्र भासते स उपाधि यथा
स्फटिकादौ जपाकुसुमादि विषमव्याप्तोपाधौ च व्याप्यत्वाभावात्तद्धर्मस्य साधनाभि
मते ऽनवभासनादिति चेत सत्य समव्याप्त एवार्द्रेन्धनप्रभववह्निमत्त्वादौ मुख्य उपाधि

Nor is invariable concomitance the not being a subject of incompatibility with the predicate, since incompatibility with a predicate does not exist in an inference from only positive conditions for such incompatibility means containing that which does not contain the predicate

Nor is invariable concomitance the possession of a form determined by the same connection as something else as for instance, the fiery is determined by connection with smoke This is not the case for the fiery is more extensive [fire existing where there is no smoke as in a heated lump of iron] Were it the case there would be observed a wider extension [of the nature of fire] characterised by invariable co existence [with smoke] there being a wide extension of the nature of smoke [or vapour] inasmuch as there exists smoke [or vapour] pendant on the surface of the sky [cf Megha duta v 5 where it is said that a cloud is a mass of vapour light water and air] If a distinction be made for the purpose of excluding such instances it must be allowed that that which is characterised by invariable concomitance is allowed to be characterised by existence of connection and there is thus only an identical affirmation

---

पदप्रयोग अन्यत्र तु गौण गुण व्यभिचारोन्नायकत्वं यद्धि यद्व्यापकव्यभिचारि तस्य तद्व्यभिचारित्वनियमात् भवति च साध्यव्यापकस्योपाधेर्व्यभिचारि साधनम् अतः साध्यव्यभिचारीति यद्व्यापकाव्याप्यं यत् तत् तदव्याप्यम् इति व्याप्यत्वासिद्ध्युन्नायकत्वं वा सत्प्रतिपक्षोत्थापकत्वं वा पक्षे उपाधेः साध्यव्यापकस्याभावात् साध्याभावसाधनात् तदुक्तं वाप्युक्तसाध्यनियमच्युतो ऽपि कश्चिदुपाधिरुच्यते पर्यवसित नियमयन् दूषकता बीजसाम्यात् इति उच्यते चाय बाधव्यभिचारानुकूलतर्काभावप्रतिकूलतर्कः । यत्तु यद्व्यभिचारित्वेन साधनस्य साध्यव्यभिचारित्वं स उपाधिरिति तत्र तृतीया न करणे न हेतौ न प्रकारे न लक्षणे न तु यद्व्यभिचारित्वेन ज्ञातेन साधनस्य साध्यव्यभिचारित्वं इति ज्ञायते पूर्वोयम् अज्ञायमानोपाध्याव्यापनात् स्फुटव्यभिचारित्वेनापाद्यत्वापनात ये व्यतागर्भो तु दुर्निरूपः व्यभिचारोन्नायकत्वमव्यवस्थाप्य उपाध्युन्नायकत्वाच्च पक्षेतरत्वन्तु उपाधिलक्षणाक्रान्तमपि स्वव्याघातकत्वान्नोपाधिः यथा पक्षे सन्दिग्धानेकान्तिकत्वम् यदि हि तत्र न सन्देहस्तदा न पक्षता यदि पक्षता तदा सन्देहस्यावश्यकतया सन्दिग्धानैकान्तिकत्वध्रौव्यात् अवशिष्टं मयूखे स्फोटितम् ॥

If the statement that invariable concomitance consists in compatibility [or the subject's susceptibility of the predicate] has been thus shown to be fallacious we may here proceed to state that invariable co-existence is a not accidental connection By being not accidental is meant in coexistence of the predicate failing that is too widely or too narrowly affirmed only, where the argument fails Or, in other words it is in coexistence of the predicate determined by absolnte non existence dependent on absolute non-existence of all that which is in-coexistent therewith The meaning of the last two expressions is in-coexistence of the predicate such in coexistence being neither more nor less extensive than the argument In other words it is anextensiveness as extensive as the predicate If you object that this is difficult to understand by reason of the relative compound employed you must look at it and consider it again

In other words invariable concomitance is in-coexistence of the predicate absent where there is absolute non existence of that which contains the mark or argument. By absolute non-existence is meant non existence of that which has as a common characteristic a universal entity such as the fiery &c It is therefore no objection to our definition that the smoke of a culinary hearth is compatible with non existence of the smoke of a mountain for there never arises the conviction that there is not fire in that which has smoke Substantiality never has a common substratum with absolute non existence of connection for we have the conviction that there is no substance which is not conjunct. Though conjunctions singly are not included the nature of conjunction in general is so included and may be predicated universally of substance.

It may be objected that the being not contingent is absence of a concomitant and that it is difficult to describe a concomitant. This we disallow for an accident [or special condition] is that which does not invariably exist in the mark of concomitance whereas it

does invariably exist in that which is to be proved Accordingly it has been said A concomitant is accidental in relation to a mark of co existence, and not accidental in relation to that which is to be proved It may be objected This definition does not include an accident which is only not invariably present in that which is to be proved, as in the instance, Air is perceptible, for there exists in it perceptible touch, where the having an appreciable colour is [a concomitant of that which has to be proved, i e of the perceptibility of air], or in the instance "He is black, for he is the son of Mitrá [a low caste woman] where the production of blackness by cooking herbs [might be a special condition of blackness] For possession of an appreciable colour is not invariably concomitant with perceptibility, since it does not exist in the perceptibility of soul, quality and action, nor is the being produced by cooking herbs invariably concomitant with blackness inasmuch as it does not exist in a black crow, cuckoo, cloud fruit of the rose-apple, &c This objection will not hold For it was meant that a special condition is invariably present in that which is finally determined as what is to be proved, and not invariably present in the means of proof That which is finally determined as that which is to be proved has as a condition the universal presence in it of the conditions which are special The possession of appreciable colour, in the first instance is universally present in the perceptible qualified by external substantiality, and is a positive and negative condition [of the perceptible, i e it may be asserted that wherever there is appreciable colour there is perceptibility, and wherever there is not appreciable colour there is not perceptibility of external substances] In the second instance we may make a similar inference from its being observed on the authority of the Charaka and the Susruta [two medical works] that the fact of being produced by eating herbs is an attribute universally present in that which is to be proved, which is determined to be an accidental darkness in men

It may be said that this is not the meaning of the word con-

comitant for a concomitant is that of which the attributes appear in some other object, as a China rose &c [seen reflected] in crystal &c , as in the universal co existence of one thing with another, which other thing does not always co exist with the first [as in the co-existence of fire with smoke which is said to be invariable, while that of smoke with fire is not invariable] the concomitant not being inseparable does not appear in the argument This is true The term concomitant is used in its primary meaning only where there is a mutually implied co-existence as of fire produced from moist fuel [for wherever there is such fire there is also *smoke and vice versâ*] In other cases the word is employed in a secondary sense The secondary sense expresses that which is casual or accidental, according to the rule That is accidental in an object which is accidental to that which is universally present in that object The evidence of concomitance is accidental in an accident inseparable from that which is to be shewn to be concomitant. Hence from the hypothesis that the evidence of concomitance is accidental to that which is to be proved and according to the rule that what is not included in what is invariably concomitant with an object is not included in that object, we are led to conclude that there is no proof of such concomitance, or there results the possibility of a contrary argument. For if a concomitant inseparable from the predicate be not in the subject it is an argument that the predicate is not in the subject It has accordingly been said The respondent may bring forward an accident determining another conclusion, inconsistent with the establishment of the thesis maintained by the defendant, such accident being equivalent to a germinal vitiation of the thesis and this may be upheld by arguments adverse to the absence of erroneous and fallacious arguments in its favour

It may be said that that is a concomitant by the accidentalness of which the argument is accidental in relation to that which is to be proved But in this definition the third [or instrumental]

case is not employed *to express instrument, means form, or definition* Nor is the construction to be completed thus That is an accident by the accidentalness of which *being known* the argument *is known* to be accidental in relation to that which is to be proved For this definition would not apply to obvious cases of the accidental not applying to the unknown accidental A fitting sense is difficult to discover in these words since it is impossible to express an accident without stating that it is casual or accidental The being other than the subject though included in the definition of an accident, is not the definition of an accident for it would involve a contradiction Where there is an uncertain applicability to the subject, as in such a case if it be not uncertain it is not the subject and since if it be the subject it must be doubtful there is certainty of doubtful applicability That which remains to be said, may be sought in the Mayukha. U

Enumeration of fallacies

अप्रसिद्धोऽनपदेशोऽसन् सन्दिग्धश्चानपदेशः ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 Fallacious arguments are the unobserved, the non existent and the dubious

[1] For the discrimination of past and future marks of co-existence from fallacious arguments, the author proceeds to commence the section on fallacies The unobserved is that which is unaccompanied that with which no universal concomitance has been observed and the contradictory is that to which there is a repugnant universal concomitance. In this term unobserved are included that of which the inclusion is unestablished, and the contrary The non existent is that which is not in the subject, or that which is

[1] इदानीं वृत्तानां वर्तिष्यमाणानाञ्च हेतूनां हेत्वाभासाद्विवेकाय हेत्वाभासप्रकरणमारभमाण आह । अप्रसिद्ध इति अव्याप्तो ऽगृहीतव्याप्तिको विपरीतव्याप्तिकश्च विरुद्धः एतेन व्याप्यत्वासिद्धविरुद्धयोः सङ्ग्रहः असन् इति पक्षे ऽसन् अपक्षधर्म इत्यर्थः स च क्वचित स्वरूपविरहात क्वचित सन्दिग्धसाध्यविपर्ययोरभावात सिद्धसाधने सन्दिग्ध इति पक्षे साध्यसदसत्त्वकोटिद्वयोपजनकः स च संशयः समानधर्मदर्शनात् क्वचिदसाधारणधर्मदर्शनात् क्वचित पक्षे एव द्वैतः साध्यतदभावसाहचर्यदर्शनात् आद्यः साधारणानैकान्तिकः द्वितीयस्त्वसाधारणानैकान्तिकः तृतीयो ऽनुपसंहारी ॥

not an attribute of the subject This is sometimes due to th ab ence of an essential from, and sometimes to the non-existence o uncertainty and the desire of proving that which is to be proved The dubious is that which gives rise to a doubt as to the two alternatives of the existence or non existence of the predicate in the subject of the question Doubt arises sometimes from observation of a common attribute, sometimes from observation of a not common attribute, and sometimes from observation that the argument is accompanied by the predicate or the non-existence of the predicate only in respect to such and such a particular subject The first is general inconclusiveness the second is particular inconclusiveness, and the third is non-existence U

यस्माद्विषाणी तस्मादश्वः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Because this has horns, therefore it is a horse

[1] An example is here given of the fallacies of want of proof of inclusion, of contrary arguments, and of want of proof respecting the nature of the argument. U

[2] Where a hare or the like is the subject, and the being a horse that which is to be proved, and the notion of having horns the argument, in such a case there exist all the five fallacies. V

यस्माद्विषाणी तस्माद्गौरिति चानैकान्तिकस्योदाहरणम् ॥ १७ ॥

Aph. 17 And Because it has horns, therefore it is a cow is an example of the [fallacy of] plurality of consequents [or undistributed middle]

[3] Non-distribution is exemplified Where taking as the subject a buffalo it is concluded that it is a cow because it has horns, there

---

[1] तत्र व्याप्यत्वासिद्धविरुद्धस्वरूपासिद्धानामुदाहरणमाह ॥

[2] यत्र शशादिः पक्ष अश्वत्वं साध्यं विषाणित्वं हेतुस्तत्र पञ्चैव हेतुदोषाः सन्ति ।

[3] अनैकान्तिकमुदाहरति । यत्र महिषं पक्षीकृत्य अयं गौर्विषाणित्वादिति साधयति तत्र साधारणानैकान्तिकता तदा त्वाकाशं नित्यं शब्दाश्रयत्वादिति साधयति तदा ऽसाधारणानैकान्तिकता एवं शब्दो ऽनित्यः शब्दत्वादित्यादावप्यसाधारणता

is general plurality of consequents [or possibility of more than one conclusion] Where it is argued that ether is eternal because sound exists in it, there is particular many sidedness So also in such examples as Sound is non eternal because it is sound, there being no condition observed there is particular plurality of consequents But when, by *employment of argumentation to show that there* exist no contrary instances, it is proved that the predicate is in the subject, and it is known to exist in parallel, instances there is a valid middle term, for the subject has parallel instances. An argument which is not ascertained to belong to the subject pervaded is the fallacy of the not certainly known or the unproved This is of three kinds, want of proof regarding the included want of proof regarding the nature [of the argument or middle term] and want of proof regarding the subject. *Of these want of proof regarding inclusion is where no invariable* concomitance has been observed, whether because the concomitance though real has not been observed or whether there be no concomitance Hence the divisions of the unproved such as absence of favourable probable reasonings And this same fallacy of absence of proof may be divided a thousand ways according to the diversity of impossibility of predicate impossibility of subject, impossibility of both subject and predicate uncertainty or impossibility of predicate uncertainty or impossibility of subject and uncertainty or impossibility of predicate and *subject. In every* one of these cases there must arise absence of proof Now this principle I mean the argument is of three kinds according to

---

धारणानैकान्तिकमेव यदा तु विपक्षबाधकतर्कोपनीतात् पक्ष एव साध्य सिध्येत् सदा सपक्षवृत्तिताज्ञानदशाया सद्धेतुरेव पक्षस्यापि सपक्षत्वात् तत्र व्याप्तपक्षधर्मतया प्रमितो ऽसिद्ध स एव त्रिविध व्याप्यत्वासिद्ध स्वरूपासिद्ध आश्रयासिद्धश्च तत्रागृहीतव्याप्तिका व्याप्यत्वासिद्ध सत्या एव व्याप्तेरग्रहात् व्याप्तेरभावाद्वा उभयथा ऽपि तेनानुकूलतर्काभावादयो ऽसिद्धभेद स चायमसमर्थविशेषणासमर्थविशेष्यासमर्थोभयसन्दिग्धासमर्थविशेषणसन्दिग्धासमर्थविशेष्यसन्दिग्धासमर्थोभयभेदप्रपञ्चेन सहस्रधा भिद्यते सर्वत्र चात्र सिद्धिविरह एवोद्भाव्य । अथेद तत्त्व हेतुस्तावत् केवलान्वय्यन्वयव्यतिरेकिकेवलव्यतिरेकिभेदात् त्रिविध तत्र सर्वधर्मिगतो धर्म केवलान्वयी यथा प्रमेयत्वाभिधेयत्वविशेष्यत्वविशेषणत्वनित्यद्रव्यात्यन्ताभावगगनाभावगुणादिध्वंसात्यन्ताभावादय न ह्यस

its division into the purely positive the positive and negative and the purely negative Among these the purely positive is an attribute existing in all subjects of attributes such as knowableness nameableness subjectibility predicability destruction of anything containing absolute non existence of eternal substances and absolute non existence by cessation of destructible qualities &c For there is no such thing as that in which these properties do not exist The purely positive is therefore that which exists everywhere or that which cannot be absolute non existence Though these exist in themselves that is no objection It has been said Validity of reasoning is recourse to existence not the being different or indifferent That argument therefore is purely positive that which is to be proved by which is purely positive Of this the four forms existence of the subject existence of similar instances absence of contrary instances, and absence of contrary but equally susceptive subjects lead to conviction. Of an argument positive and negative together with non-existence of contrary instances there are five forms of the purely negative together with the exclusion of existence of similar instances there are four forms An apparent argument or fallacy is therefore that which is void of one or other of the forms which determine illative assurance, and similarly fallaciousness is voidness of one or other of the forms which determine illation Doubt accompanied by assurance of the voidness of one or other of the forms

---

साधुग्य किञ्चित् यत्रैत धर्मा न विद्यन्तेतथा च सर्वगतत्वम् अत्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगित्व वा केवलान्वयित्व एतेषाञ्च स्वात्मवृत्तित्वे ऽपि न दोष तदुक्तं प्रमाण परता वृत्ती न भिन्नाभिवृत्ते यत इति केवलान्वयिसाधको हेतु केवलान्वयी अस्य च पक्षसत्वसपक्षसत्वाबाधितत्वासत्प्रतिपक्षितत्वानि चत्वारि रूपाणि गमकत्वौपयिकानि अन्वयव्यतिरेकिणस्तु हेतोर्विपक्षासत्वेन सह पञ्च केवलव्यतिरेकिण सपक्षसत्वव्यतिरेकेण चत्वारि तथा च यस्य हेतोर्यावन्ति रूपाणि गमकत्वौपयिकानि तदन्यतररूपहीन स हेत्वाभास एवञ्च गमकत्वौपयिकान्यतररूपशून्यत्व हेत्वाभासत्व तदन्यतररूपशून्यत्वस्य निश्चयदशायां हेत्वनुमितिप्रतिबन्धक त्वादिति तदसाधकताबाधक न च केवलान्वयिकेवलव्यतिरेकिणोर्हेत्वोरन्यतररूपशून्यतया हेत्वाभासत्वापत्ति केवलान्वयिनि विपक्षासत्वस्य केवलव्यतिरेकिणि सपक्षसत्वस्य गमकत्वौपयिकत्वाभावात् एवञ्चाश्रयासिद्धस्वरूपासिद्धभागासिद्धाना पक्षसत्वरूपविरहादाभासत्व व्याप्यत्वासिद्धविरुद्धसाधारणानैकान्तिकाना विप

prevents inference and proves the inconclusiveness of the defendant's argument. Fallaciousness is not incident upon voidness of one or other of the two arguments the purely positive and the purely negative, because of the non existence of that which leads to the conviction of there not being contrary instances in the purely positive and of there being similar instances in the purely negative. Absence of proof respecting the subjects respecting the *nature of the argument*, and *partial inconclusiveness are fallacies* by reason of the absence of that form which is existence of the subject. Absence of proof of inclusion self contradiction, and general plurality of consequents are fallacies due to the form which is non-existence of contrary instances. Particular diversity of result and *non exclusion are fallacies due to the failure of similar* instances. Impossibility [where the predicate does not exist in the subject] and possibility of a contrary subject are fallacies due to the absence of possibility and of impossibility of contrary subjects. In like manner accidentalness and inapplicability in an argument fail to *determine illation because of the absence of certainty of*

चासत्त्वरूपवैकल्यात् असाधारणानैकान्तिकानुपसंहारिणोः सपक्षसत्त्ववैकल्यात् बाधित सत्प्रतिपक्षितयोरबाधितत्वासत्प्रतिपक्षितत्वविरहात् एव सोपाधिस्याप्रयोजकत्वयोरपि विपक्षासत्त्वनिश्चयाभावादगमकत्वम् अनुकूलतर्काभावप्रतिकूलतर्कयोरपि विपक्षासत्त्वनिश्चयविरहात् एव साध्यविकलसाधनविकलोभयविकलदृष्टान्ताभासानां यदि हेत्वाभासविधया दोषत्वं तदा सपक्षसत्त्वानिश्चयात् यदि स्वातन्त्र्येण दृष्टान्ताभासतया तथापि द्वारं हेतोः सपक्षसत्त्वानिश्चय एव अनुपदर्शितान्वयानुपदर्शितव्यतिरेकास्तु न्यूनाख्यनिग्रहस्थानपर्यवसन्ना एव आत्माश्रयान्योन्याश्रयचक्रकानवस्थास्तु व्याप्तिनिश्चयं विघटयन्त सपक्षसत्त्वविपक्षासत्त्वान्यतररूपविकला एव हेत्वाभासतामासादयन्ति तत्र पक्षसाध्यसदसत्त्वकोटिकसंशयजनको हेत्वाभासः सव्यभिचारः पक्षे साध्याभावनिश्चयफलको हेत्वाभासो विरुद्धः व्याप्तिपक्षधर्मताप्रमितिविरहो ऽसिद्धः बाधसत्प्रतिपक्षौ काश्यपे मते न स्वतन्त्रौ तत्र बाध आश्रयासिद्धावनैकान्तिके वा पर्यवसति तदुक्तं बाधायाम पक्षधर्मो हेतुरनैकान्तिको वा इति सत्प्रतिपक्षो ऽन्यतरत्र व्याप्त्यादिसंशयमापादयन् अनैकान्तिकादावेव पर्यवसति वृत्तिकारस्तु अप्रसिद्धो ऽनपदेशो ऽसन् सन्दिग्धश्चानपदेश इति सूत्रस्थचकारस्य बाधसत्प्रतिपक्षसमुच्चयार्थतामाह तेन सव्यभिचारविरुद्धप्रकरणसमसाध्यसमातीतकालाः पञ्च हेत्वाभासा इति गौतमीयमेव मतमनुधावति परन्तु विरुद्धासिद्धसन्दिग्धमलिङ्गं काश्यपो ऽब्रवीत् इत्याद्यभिधानात् सूत्रकारस्वरसो हेत्वाभासत्रित्वे चकारस्तूक्तसमुच्चयार्थ इति सत्यं ग्रन्थगौरवभयात् प्रपञ्चो न कृतो मयूखे विस्तरो ऽन्वेष्टव्य ॥

the non-existence of contrary instances Absence of favourable and unfavourable probable argumentation also fail to determine illation, because of the absence of certitude as to the non-existence of contrary instances In like manner apparent but unreal examples inadequate in regard to that which is to be proved or in regard to the argument invalid as being fallacious are so through the uncertainty of the existence of similar instances. If they are immediately invalid as being examples in appearance only, yet are they so mediately through the arguments on account of the uncertainty of the existence of similar instances Arguments where neither positiveness nor negativeness can be shown are concluded by urging the objection that time is insufficient or not to be obtained Petitio principii, arguing in a circle, and arguments which involve an infinite regression though they should afford conviction of a universal concomitance being deficient of one or other of the forms or conditions of valid argumentation i. e. of existence of similar instances or non existence of contrary instances, involve fallaciousness The fallacy which gives rise to doubt with respect to the alternatives of the existence or non-existence of the predicate in the subjects is that of including too much or too little in the enunciation of a sumption The fallacy which results in certainty of the non existence of that which is to be proved in the subject is the contradictory Absence of certain knowledge of what are the attributes of a subject of a general proposition is the unproved. But in the opinion of Káśyapa the impossible and the existence of contrary but equally valid subjects are not independent fallacies Of these the impossible is determined to be included in absence of proof as regards the subject or plurality of consequents Therefore it has been said An impossible or too extensive attribute of the subject as an argument leads to diverse results Valid counter subject also showing the doubtfulness of the universal concomitance he determines to be included in plurality of consequents The author of the Vritti asserts that

the particle and in the aphorism, Fallacious arguments are the unproved, the non-existent and the dubious, implies the addition of the impossible, and possibility of a real contradictory subject. He therefore follows the doctrine of Gautama The five merely apparent arguments are that of which the extension is too great or too small, that which involves a contradiction, that which is identical with the subject, that which is identical with the major term, and that the time of which is the past But the author's own view of the fallacious appears from such statements as that Káśyapa declared the *self contradictory* the unproved, and the *doubtful* to be no arguments, and the particle and in reality serves to connect the aphorism with the preceding aphorisms Prolixity has been avoided in this note from fear of needlessly encumbering the treatise Full *details may be sought in the Mayúkha* U

The existence of the soul proved. आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षाद्यन्निष्पद्यते तदन्यत् ॥ १८ ॥

Aph. 18 That which is effectuated from the connection of soul with objects of sense is other [than a fallacious argument.]

[1] The result of the distinction drawn between fallacies is now stated It is by connection of the soul with objects of sense that knowledge is produced, and knowledge, the argument for existence of the soul, is other than the unproved, the contradictory, and plurality of consequents, i. e it is not an argument in appearance only. Knowledge, then, is in two ways a mark of the existence of the soul, either because knowledge must exist in knowing subject, because it is an effect, like colour, or because it assumes the form of recollection, I who saw am the same as I who am touching In the for-

[1] इदानीं हेत्वाभासविवेचनस्य फलमाह । आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षात्तायज्ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते तच्चात्मनि लिङ्गम् असिद्धविरुद्धानैकान्तिकेभ्यो ऽन्यत् अनाभासमित्यर्थः । तथाहि ज्ञानमात्मन्युभयथा लिङ्गम् ज्ञान क्वचिदाश्रितं कार्यत्वाद्रूपादिवदिति वा प्रत्यभिज्ञारूपतया वा यो ऽहमद्राक्षं सो ऽहं स्पृशामीति तत्र ज्ञानगतं कार्यत्वं नासिद्धं यदिदमुत्पद्यत इत्यभिधानात् न विरुद्धं सामान्यतो दृष्टे ऽत्र विरोधाभावात् न चानैकान्तिकं तत एव तथा च स्वगतकार्यत्वगुणत्वद्वारा सामान्यतो दृष्टेन ज्ञानमेवात्मनि लिङ्गम् प्रत्यभिज्ञा तु भिन्नकर्तृकेभ्यो व्यावर्तमानमेककर्तृकतायां पर्यवस्यति ॥

mer case that knowledge is an effect is not unproved knowledge being designated in the text as that which is produced, nor is it contradictory for there can be no contradiction with regard to what is universally observed, and on the same grounds it is not many sided Knowledge, then mediately through its nature as being an effect or an attribute is a mark of the existence of the soul Again recollection being excluded from diverse agents is limited to a single agency U

Plurality of souls प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्तिश्च प्रत्यगात्मनि दृष्टे परत्र लिङ्गम्॥१९॥

Aph 19 Activity and inactivity observed in one's own soul are the mark of the existence of other souls

[1] The inference of the existence of soul being explained the mode in which the existence of other souls is inferred is now stated Activity and inactivity generated by desire and aversion are modes of volition By activity and inactivity bodily functions having for their end attainment of the pleasant and avoidance of the unpleasant and characterised by muscular action are produced Therefore when we see muscular action in the body of another, we infer in the following manner the existence of another soul This muscular action is generated by volition being a muscular action like our own muscular action, and this volition is produced by or exists in soul being a volition like our own volitions U

[2] Though in going and other actions activity only and not inactivity is seen to be the cause yet muscular action in such forms

---

[1] आत्मन्यनुमानमभिधाय इदानीं परात्मानुमानमाह । प्रत्यगात्मनीति स्वात्मनि स्वयं इच्छाद्वेषजनिते प्रवृत्तिनिवृत्ती प्रयत्नविशेषौ ताभ्यां च हिताहितप्राप्तिपरिहारफलके शरीरकर्मणी चेष्टालक्षणे जन्येते तथा च परशरीरे चेष्टां दृष्ट्वा एवं चेष्टा प्रयत्नजन्या चेष्टात्वात् मदीयचेष्टावत् स च प्रयत्न आत्मजन्य आत्मनिष्ठो वा प्रयत्नत्वात् मदीयप्रयत्नवदिति परात्मानुमानम् ॥

[2] यद्यपि गमनादिक्रियायां प्रवृत्तिरेव हेतुर्दृश्यते न तु निवृत्तिरिति तथापि हिंसादिनिवृत्तितो गन्तव्यदेशावस्थितानां क्षुद्रजन्तूनां व्यजनादिना अपसारणादिरूपा चेष्टा अपि दृश्यते एवेति नानुपपत्तिः ॥

as the expulsion of insects with a fly flapper from places of resort *for the sake of inactivity in regard to injury, is observed* There is therefore no want of proof that inactivity is a motive of muscular action V

SECOND DAILY LESSON

Examination of the internal sensory

आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षे ज्ञानस्य भावोऽभावश्च मनसो लिङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Existence and non existence of knowledge on contact of the soul with the objects of sense are the mark of the existence of an internal organ

[1] Distinction of real and fallacious arguments is the object of the preceding daily lesson In order now to bring the investigation of soul to a conclusion by a breach of the order of enunciation (i e of the order in which the substances were enumerated) an examination of the internal organ is instituted It will be shown that movement of this organ is the mark of the existence of the soul If the interior sensory be examined as being an instrument of

---

[1] हेत्वहेत्वाभासविवेक आह्निकार्थ । इदानीमात्मपरीक्षाशेष वर्णयिष्यन् उद्देश क्रमलङ्घनेन मन परीक्षामवतारयन्नाह । मनोगतिमात्मना लिङ्ग वक्ष्यति तद यदि मनो ज्ञानकरणत्वेन मूर्तत्वेन च परीक्षित भवति तदा तत्प्रेरित मन इन्द्रियान्तरादभिमत विषयग्राहिणि इन्द्रिय सम्बध्यत स आत्मेति सिद्ध भवत्यतदर्थ क्रमलङ्घनम । आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षे सति यस्मिन् इन्द्रियसन्निकृष्टे ज्ञानस्य भाव उत्पाद असन्निकृष्टे ज्ञानस्याभावो ऽनुत्पादस्तन्मन इत्यर्थ ननु मनोविभवे ऽपि करणधर्मत्वादेव ज्ञानायोगपद्य मुपपद्यते किञ्च मनो विभु विशेषगुणशून्यद्रव्यत्वात् कालवत ज्ञानासमवायिकारणस योगाधारत्वादात्मवत् स्पर्शात्यन्ताभाववत्त्वादाकाशवदित्यादि वैभवसाधक प्रमाणमिति चेत मैव यदि मनो विभु स्यात तदा सर्वेन्द्रियसन्निकृष्टात् तत सर्वेन्द्रियकमेकमेव ज्ञान स्यात कार्याविरोधाच्चैवमिति चेन्न न हि सामग्री विरोधाविरोधमाकलयति येन चाक्षुषत्वरासनत्वादिविरोधाय भिद्यत चित्ररूपवत चित्रज्ञानमेव वा स्यात भवत्यत्र दोषश्च स्फुटीभवत्यस्खल इति चेन्न तत्रापि व्यासङ्गदर्शनात् तर्हि रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शान् युगपत प्रत्यमीति कथमनुव्यवसाय इति चेन्न शीघ्रसञ्चारिमनोजनितेषु पञ्चसु स्वल्पपनीतज्ञानेषु यौगपद्याभिमानात व्यासङ्गो ऽपि करणधर्माधीन इति चेन्न उक्तोत्तरत्वात बुभुत्साधीनो व्यासङ्ग इति चेन्न सर्वबुभुत्साया सर्वविषयकसर्वोदयप्रसङ्गात बुभुत्साया अपि अभिमतार्थग्राहीन्द्रियमन सम्बन्धमात्रफलकत्वात तस्माज्ज्ञानायौगपद्यान्यथानुपपत्त्या सिध्यति अणु मन ॥

cognition and as having form then soul is proved to exist as that by which the internal organ is actuated when it is brought into connection with an organ of sense apprehensive of its proper object in consequence of the other organ. This is the reason of the breach of the order of enumeration That is the internal organ which being in connection with an organ of sense, when there is contact of the soul and an object of sense, knowledge exists or comes into being and which not being in connection with an organ of sense knowledge does not exist or does not come into being It may be argued that though the internal organ were an all pervading substance, all cognition would not necessarily be simultaneous, because of its property as an instrument, further, that the internal organ is an all pervading substance, because, like time, it is a substance void of any peculiar attribute, because like soul it is the site of conjunction with the non-coinhesive cause of knowledge, because, like ether, it possesses absolute negation of sound, and so forth If this argument to prove that it is an all pervading substance be adduced, we reply that were the internal sensory an all pervading substance then as it would be in contact with all sensual organs, cognition would be one only and composed of all sensation If it be replied that such is not the case because there is a contrariety among the effects we deny this for the instrument is not concerned with contrariety or non contrariety, so that one should be apprehensive of a contrariety between visibility and sapidity and the rest, or that there should be a variegated form, as there is a variegated colour If you object that there is a plurality of simultaneous sensations in the case of eating a long ear of corn [which is at once seen and tasted] we deny this for in that case also distraction is observed. If you ask how it is that you are conscious of synchronous perception of colour, taste smell and touch, we reply that neither is this the case for this is merely a sense of simultaneity in five cognitions represented in memory and produced successively by the rapidly shifting internal organ If be urged that the distraction depends on the property of the in

strument, we deny this, for the answer has been already stated If it be maintained that the distraction depends on the desire of knowing, we deny this, for on that supposition it would follow that when *there was a desire to know* all there would be a *total presentation* of all objects, whereas the only result of a desire to know is connection of the internal organ with the sense organ percipient of its proper object Inasmuch, therefore, as non simultaneity of cognition would be otherwise impossible, the internal organ is proved *to possess atomic dimension* U

तस्य द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Its substantiality and eternity are explained by air

[1] It may be urged that the internal organ which is proved to exist by *the inference that a sense of pleasure &c is effected by an* instrument because it is an action, like the sense of colour &c, or because simultaneous cognition is impossible, is proved to exist as an instrument whence, then, its substantiality and eternity? It is therefore stated that, as an aerial atom inferred to exist by reason *of the compound substance air, is a substance because it possesses* qualities and actions, so the internal sensory inferred from impossibility of simultaneous cognitions is a substance because it possesses qualities For without conjunction with the organs of sense it would not be productive of cognition so that there would be no *possession of qualities* Moreover *presentation of pleasure &c must* have a sensitive organ as its instrument, because, like the presentation of colour &c, it is a presentation Therefore the internal sen-

[1] ननु सुखाद्युपलब्धि करणसाध्या क्रियात्वात रूपोपलब्धिवदित्याद्यनुमानात युगपज्ज्ञानानुपपत्त्या च यन्मन· सिद्धं तत्करणतया तथा च तस्य द्रव्यत्व नित्यत्वञ्च कुत इत्यत आह । यथा ऽवयविद्रव्यानुमितो वायुपरमाणुर्गुणवत्त्वात् क्रियावत्त्वाच्च द्रव्यम् तथा युगपज्ज्ञानानुपपत्त्या ऽनुमितं मनो गुणवत्त्वाद्द्रव्य न हि तस्य इन्द्रियसंयोगान्तरेण ज्ञानोत्पादकत्व येन गुणवत्त्व न स्यात किञ्च सुखादिसाक्षात्कार इन्द्रियकरणक: साक्षात्कारत्वात् रूपादिसाक्षात्कारवदितीन्द्रियत्वेन मन· सिद्धम् इन्द्रियत्वं ज्ञानकारणमन·संयोगाश्रयत्वमित्यर्थसिद्धमेव मनसो द्रव्यत्वम् नित्यत्वञ्च तस्यानाश्रितत्वात सस्यावयवकल्पनायां प्रमाणाभावादनाश्रितत्वमिति ॥

sory is proved to exist as an organ. The nature of an organ is to be a site of conjunction of the internal sensory with the cause of a cognition. It is therefore established without any difficulty that the internal organ is a substance. Its eternity is proved by its having no substratum, and that it has no substratum follows from the absence of any warrant in imagining portions constituent of it. U

[1] As there is in an aerial atom substantiality inasmuch as it possesses originative conjunction and other attributes, and eternity inasmuch as there is no warrant for assuming that it has constituent parts, so the substantiality and eternity of the internal organ follow from its possession of conjunction productive of cognition and its possession of other attributes and from absence of proof of its production and destruction. V

प्रयत्नायौगपद्याज्ज्ञानायौगपद्याच्चैकम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3. Because of non-simultaneity of volitions and non-simultaneity of cognitions it is one [in each body.]

[2] A decision is stated with reference to the doubt whether internal organ be one in individual bodies or more than one. The words internal organs and in each body are to be supplied. If there were in each single body many internal organs or common sensories there would be simultaneity of cognitions and volitions. The opinion that many volitions are simultaneously exerted since we see simultaneous action in the arms, legs, fingers and toes of a dancer is erroneous, for this arises merely from the rapid transition of the internal organ. U

---

[1] यथा वायवीयपरमाणोः आरम्भकसंयोगादिरूपगुणवत्त्वाद् द्रव्यत्वं तदवयवकल्पनायां प्रमाणाभावान्नित्यत्वं तथा ज्ञानजनकसंयोगादिरूपगुणवत्त्वात् तदुत्पादविनाशयोः प्रमाणाभावाच्च मनसोऽपि द्रव्यत्वं नित्यत्वञ्चेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] तत् किं प्रतिशरीरमेकमनेकं वेति सन्देहे निर्णायकमाह । मनः प्रतिशरीरमिति शेषः यद्येकैकस्मिन्नपि शरीरे बहूनि मनांसि स्युस्तदा ज्ञानप्रयत्नानां यौगपद्यं स्यात् यत्तु नर्त्तकीकरचरणाङ्गुलीषु युगपत् कर्मदर्शनाद्युगपदेव बहवः प्रयत्ना उत्पद्यन्ते इति मतं तदयुक्तं मनसः शीघ्रसञ्चारादेव तदुपपत्तेः ॥

[1] The unity of the internal organ* in individual bodies is established When there is conjunction between the mind and any member of the body, a volition is exerted in restriction to that member, and not in restriction to other members. It must not therefore be said that there being a plurality of internal sensories two volitions may be simultaneously exerted because conjunction between the mind and each of two members at the same time is possible, and that as determined by the ten fingers and ten toes twenty acts of volition are produced at the same time [for otherwise how would the corresponding actions be produced?], for the feeling of simultaneity in those actions as of that in the scattering of the hundred petals of a lotus is illusory inasmuch as they are produced in successive moments merely by the rapid transition of the internal sensory So if the internal organ were manifold, then since each internal organ might be in conjunction with synchronous sensations of smell taste &c simultaneous production of cognitions derived from the organs of smell taste &c would be possible The internal sensory therefore is in each individual body one only and not manifold If it be objected that the internal organ must necessarily be manifold since we observe action in the two parts of a scorpion and the like when cut in two we reply that this is not the

---

[1] प्रतिशरीरं मनस एकत्वं व्यवस्थापयति । यदङ्गेन मनसः संयोगो यदा भवति तदा तदङ्गावच्छेदेन प्रयत्न उत्पद्यते नान्यावच्छेदेन एवञ्च मनसो नानात्वे एकदा ऽङ्गुद्वयेनापि एकैकस्य मनसः संयोगसम्भवात् प्रयत्नद्वयमुत्पद्यते न च विंशत्यङ्गुल्यवच्छेदेन एकदैव विंशतिः प्रयत्ना उत्पद्यन्ते कथमन्यथा एकदैव तेषां क्रिया उत्पद्यन्ते यात्वम् उत्पलपत्रशतव्यतिभेद इव तासु यौगपद्यप्रतीतिर्भ्रमरूपत्वात् मनस आशु सञ्चारादेव भिन्नभिन्नक्षणेषु तासामुत्पादात् एवं मनसो नानात्वे युगपदेव घ्राणरसनादिभिः सह तेषामेकैकस्य संयोगसम्भवात् घ्राणजरासनादीनामपि युगपदुत्पादप्रसक्तिः प्रतिशरीरं मन एकमेव न तु नानेत्यर्थः । ननु छिन्नवृश्चिकादिखण्डद्वये एव क्रियादर्शनान्मनसो नानात्वमावश्यकमिति चेन्न तदानीमदृष्टवशेन मनोऽन्तरसंविशेषादेव तत्सम्भवात् अन्यत्र प्रयत्नायौगपद्यस्य ज्ञानायौगपद्यस्य च प्रामाणिकत्वेन मनसो नानात्वस्वीकारस्य कर्तुमशक्यत्वादिति । कूर्मशुण्डादिवन्मनसः सङ्कोचविकाशाभ्यामेव प्रयत्नानां ज्ञानानाञ्च यौगपद्यायौगपद्ययोर्निर्वाह एकमेवैकस्मिन् शरीरे मन इति केचित् तदपि न मनोऽमम अनन्तावयवानां तत्प्रागभावानां तत्प्रध्वंसानाम् अनन्ततत्परमाणूनाञ्च कल्पने महागौरवादिति सङ्क्षेपः ॥

changed except by volition Nor can it be objected that two airs with differently directed motion may like two pieces of confluent water, have an upward motion Were this the case there would be an upward but not a downward motion, or in exsufflations and the like there would be horizontal motion There is then a being who, by his volition impels the vital air upwards or downwards It is no valid objection to ask how there could be upward and downward motions of the vital air in a condition of dreamless sleep; for at that time though volition proper does not exist there exists another kind of volition which is called automatic conation In like manner the opening and closing of the eyes causes us to infer a ruler of the body, for closing the eyes is an action productive of conjunction of the eyelids and the opening of the eyes is an action productive of disjunction of the eyelids These two actions being constantly manifested without any visible cause such as motive force are not produced otherwise than by conation As the dancing of a doll depends upon the volition of a subject willing so also does the movement of the eyelids Therefore a being who exerts volition is inferred Similarly vitality is a mark of the existence of the soul for by the word life the effects of vitality such as growth reparation of muscular lesion &c are indicated by implication For as the owner of a house builds up the broken edifice or enlarges a building which is too small so the ruler of the body effects by food &c the increase or enlargement of the body which is to him in the stead of a habitation, and with medicine and the like causes what is wounded to grow again and partially dissevered hands or feet to re coalesce Thus like the master of a house is proved a guardian of the body In a like manner the motions of the internal sensory are also a mark of the existence of the soul For it has been shown in the foregoing section that the internal organ is possessed of form and of indivisibility Its appliance to an instrument of sense cognisant of its proper object, depends on desire and effort The desire and effort which actuate the internal organ are

inferred to be identical with the soul This may be exemplified by a child standing in a corner of a room, who throws a ball or a handful of red powder about the room It may be objected that the dancer of the doll, the master of the house, and the child are not other than body that they should be examples, and that it is in the body that consciousness resides, inasmuch as the body is an object of self-consciousness the conviction of being pale, stout and the like is produced by the juxta position of the body with self consciousness Moreover, (it may be urged), that which was experienced in childhood is remembered in youth or in old age, whereas in the case of separate bodies as those of Chaitra and Maitra there would be no act of memory, as it is said, One man remembers not that which another saw In the latter case there will be no recollection because Chaitra and Maitra are the offspring of different parents, but though childhood and youth be different, the act of recollection will take place in the order of cause and effect because there is but one individual To this we reply that it would follow on the same premisses that the son would remember what was experienced by the father If it be rejoined that perception of difference of body prevents this, we reply that an old man, by having a body different from that which he had as a child, through perception of his body would be incapable of remembering what he experienced as a child A child that never knew his father has no perception of difference of body The notion my body as generally in the case of the word my belongs to the self consciousness If you reply that so also does the notion my soul we reply that such is not the case, for the word my is usual tropically, since the genitive may be used where no numerical difference is implied as in the case of Rahu's head [where Rahu and Rahu's head are one and the same thing] Moreover on your supposition there would result the loss of merits and requital unmerited, for the body is constantly different in the transmigratory state, but it is admitted that the harm done by a conscious subject, cannot have its the result unful-

filled It is also inferred from affections of the other organs that there is a soul, for after experiencing the particular taste which accompanies the particular colour of an orange or *chira-villa* fruit, on again observing such fruit, there arises in one desirous of tasting it a watering in the mouth This can only take place by an inference respecting the acid flavour, the inference only by recalling the invariable coexistence of the colour and taste, the revocation only by a permanent impression, the permanent impression only by experience of the universal co-existence, and experience only by seeing it repeatedly, and this series of cognitions, in the order of cause and effect is impossible unless there be one and the same agent in all. Accordingly the aphorism of Gautama, From the affection of other organs of sense Pleasure and the like are also to be regarded, like knowledge, as arguments of the existence of the soul. For pleasure and the like must inhere in something, that is, reside in some substratum, being products or qualities like colour &c. Hence a general inference accompanied by a residual inference takes for its object inherence in a substance other than eight substances For the proposition that desire which does not inhere in earth and seven other substances, inheres in a substance, is incomplete unless it assumes as its object inhesion in a substance other than those eight substances But if the residual method be not first employed, inhesion in a substance other than eight substances will have to be argued by negative probation and thus the division will be made. It is absurd to say that inference has for its form only that which is essential to universal co-existence, for that is the form of conviction without which the conviction is incomplete Otherwise there could be no inference having for its object inhesion in what is uncaused such as that a binary atomic aggregate which does not inhere in anything caused or produced, inheres in something because it is composite U

तस्य द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Its substantiality and eternity are explained by air

[1] It may be said Granted that the soul is perdurable, why is it eternal and why a substance? It is therefore stated that as there is no warrant for assuming that an aerial atom has parts and therefore it is eternal so also is soul eternal, and that as an aerial atom is a substance because it possesses attributes so also is soul a substance U

Objections to the preceding arguments

यज्ञदत्त इति सन्निकर्षे प्रत्यक्षाभावाद्दृष्टलिङ्ग न विद्यते ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 In the contact [of the organs of sense and the object] from which the judgment This is Yajna-datta is derived, there being no perception, there exists no visible mark

[2] There being contact if in the judgment This is Yajna-datta there is no act of perception, there is no visible mark, no mark by which a universal co existence is ascertained from perception There is no visible mark establishing the existence of soul as there is a visible mark in the case of fire viz smoke observed concomitant with fire perceived U

[3] Though there be contact of the eye and other organs with the body of Yajna datta yet since there is no visual or other perception of the soul which presides over that body there is no visible mark i e no mark which being invariably attended by a predicate is an object of perception How then is an inference of the existence of the soul possible? For there being contact with fire &c,

---

[1] ननु सिध्यतु आत्मा स्थिर सतु नित्य इति कुत कुतश्च द्रव्यमित्याह यथा वायुपरिमाणोरवयवकल्पनाया न प्रमाणमतो नित्यत्व तथा च मनोऽपि यथा गुणवत्त्वाद्वायुपरमाणुद्रव्य तथात्माऽपीत्यार्थ ॥

[2] सन्निकर्षे सति अय यज्ञदत्त इति चेत् प्रत्यक्ष नास्ति तदा दृष्ट प्रत्यक्षतो गृहीतव्याप्तिक लिङ्ग नास्ति यथा वह्निना प्रत्यक्षेण सहचरितो गृहीतो धूमो वह्नेः दृष्ट लिङ्ग तथात्मसाधक लिङ्ग दृष्टं नास्तीत्यर्थ ॥

[3] यज्ञदत्तशरीरे चक्षुरादिसन्निकर्षे सत्यपि तदधिष्ठातुरात्मनश्चाक्षुषाद्यभावात् दृष्ट व्याप्यत्वेन प्रत्यक्षविषयीभूत लिङ्ग नास्तीत्यत कथमात्मानुमान सुघटम वह्न्यादौ सन्निकर्षे तत्प्रत्यक्षानन्तर तद्व्याप्तिप्रत्यक्षाद्धूमाद्यनुमानन्तु निराबाधमवेति भाव ॥

after the perception of it an inference as to fire &c. meets with no obstacle because universal concomitance therewith has been observed, but this is not the case with the present inference V

सामान्यतो दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Moreover, from that which is observed generally [1]there results no distinction.

[1] Though there is a generally observed mark, yet there is no proof therefrom of the existence of the soul from its nature as soul or as a substance over and above eight substances It would be thereby established only that desires &c must inhere in something but there is nothing to suggest the thought of a soul Therefore it is stated that there results no distinction U

[2] From that which is generally observed i. e from observation of inclusion under something determined by a general attribute, there results no distinction i. e no inference from a peculiar property, according to the rule that there must be observed in that which determines the character of the subject determination by the predicate under which the middle term is contained V

तस्मादागमिकः ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Therefore the soul is proved to exist by revelation

[3] The existence of the soul &c rests on revelation for, inasmuch as there is no mark of an observed universal concomitance any inference of the existence of the soul is impossible The exis

[1] सामान्यतो दृष्टमपि लिङ्गं भवति न तु तत आत्मत्वेन अष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तत्वाद्व्यत्वेन वा स्यादात्मसिद्धिः किन्तु तेनेच्छादीनां क्वचिदाश्रितत्वमात्रं सिध्येत् तत्र आत्मनोपयिकमित्यर्थः तदेतदाह अविशेष इति ॥

[2] सामान्यतो दृष्टात् सामान्यधर्मावच्छिन्नव्याप्यत्वग्रहात् अविशेषः विशेषधर्मप्रकारेण नानुमितिः व्यापकतावच्छेदकत्वप्रकारस्यैवानुमितिविधेयतावच्छेदकत्वे तन्त्रत्वादि र्थः ॥

[3] आगमिक इत्यस्य आत्मेत्यादि यतो गृहीतव्याप्तिकलिङ्गाभावादात्मनोऽनुमितिर्न सम्भवति अत आत्मा आगममात्रप्रमाणक इत्यर्थः । तथा चात्ममननार्थमेतच्छास्त्रं कृतमिति भावः ॥

tence then of the soul rests solely on the authority of revelation Thus this system for cogitation on the soul is useless. V

Objections answered

अहमिति शब्दस्य व्यतिरेकान्नागमिकम् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Existence of the soul being the *conditio sine quâ non* of the use of the word I is not evidenced only by revelation

* Revelation is not the sole evidence of the existence of the soul, but that there is a soul is evinced also by the inference that the word I, or the word soul must denote some object because it is a term like the terms water pot &c It might be said Let earth &c. be the objects which it denotes Hence the words because it is the *conditio sine quâ non* of the use of the word I that is, because the term I is excluded from earth &c For there never arises any such supposition or assurance as I am earth I am water, I am light, I am air, I am ether I am time, I am space I am mind If you object that such assurance arises in relation to the body, we reply that it is not so for it would be equally applicable to the bodies of others if that it arises with

* नागममात्रं प्रमाणमात्मनि किन्त्वहमिति पदं वा साभिधेयं पदत्वात् घटादिपदवत् इत्यनुमानादप्यात्मसिद्धिः । ननु पृथिव्यादि तदभिधेयं स्यादित्यत आह व्यतिरेकादिति पृथिव्यादितो ऽहमिति पदस्य व्यतिरेकाद्व्यावृत्तेरित्यर्थः । न हि भवत्यहं पृथिवी अहमापः अहं तेजः अहं वायुः अहमाकाशम् अहं कालः अहं दिक् अहं मन इति व्यपदेशः प्रत्ययो वा शरीरे भवतीति चेन्न परशरीरे तत्प्रसङ्गात् स्वशरीरे भवतीति चेन्न स्वत्वस्यात्मभिन्नत्वानिरुक्तेः मम शरीरमिति वैयधिकरण्येन प्रत्ययाच्च नन्विदमपि सामान्यतोदृष्टमेव तच्च विशेषापर्यवसन्नमिति दूषितमेवेति चेन्न अहम्पदे ऽनन्यमात्मत्वमेव प्रकारः तथा च पक्षधर्मताबलादेवाहन्त्वस्य प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तत्वपर्यवसन्नं तच्चानन्यसाधारणमेवेति विशेषसिद्धेः एवं सामान्यतो दृष्टादपि बाधसहकृताद्विशेषसिद्धिः यच्चोक्तं श्रवणादेव साक्षात्कारः किं मननेनेति तदयुक्तं न हि मननमन्तरेण शङ्काकलङ्कस्याश्रद्धामलक्षालनम् न च तदन्तरेण तत्र निदिध्यासनाधिकारः न च निदिध्यासनमन्तरेण सवासनमिथ्याज्ञानोन्मूलनक्षमस्तत्त्वसाक्षात्कारः न हि शाब्दमानुमानिकं वा ज्ञानं मिथ्याज्ञानोन्मूलनक्षमं भवति दिङ्मोहादौ दृष्टमिति भावः । ननु तथापि परोक्षे आत्मनि कथं सङ्केतग्रह इति चेत् क एवमाह नात्मा प्रत्यक्ष इति किन्तु मनसा संयोगप्रत्यासत्त्यात्मप्रत्यक्षं कथमन्यथाहं सुखी जानामीच्छामि यते दुःखीत्यादिप्रत्ययः न ह्ययमवस्तुकः सन्दिग्धवस्तुको वा भीलादिप्रत्ययवत् अस्यापि निश्चितवस्तुकत्वात् न च लैङ्गिकः लिङ्गज्ञानमन्तरेणापि जायमानत्वात् नापि शाब्दः तदनुसन्धानाननुविधानात् प्रत्यक्षाभासो ऽयमिति चेन्न तर्हि क्वचिद्बाधसिद्धये ऽपि न सम्भवतमारोप्यते इत्याशयेनैदर्शयिष्यत ॥

respect to *one's own body we reply that this is not so, for there is not* intended a self different from soul and because the term my body involves a difference of substrata If you urge that this also is *merely observed generally* and therefore, *not being* determined by a peculiar attribute, involves a fallacy, we reply that it is not so, for in the term I egoity or spirituality is the form or essence, and that as an attribute of the subject it is determined that the ego is the cause of activity and this is not common to other objects, being a proof of a particular object. In like manner there is proof of the particular even from the generally observed, accompanied with the argument from impossibility Whereas it is said, From merely hearing *results presentation of soul* what need of this proof? this is wrong, for without reflection the dross of unbelief in wavering minds cannot be purged away, without this purification there can be no aptitude for *profound meditation* on this object and without profound meditation there can be no presentation of truth competent to eradicate false knowledge together with its impressions For it is by consuetude only that the sad lover can represent in imagination his beloved For knowledge from verbal *information or from inference is unable to uproot false* knowledge, as in seen in the case of illusion in regard to direction in space and similar instances If it be asked how whereas soul is invisible a sign of its existence can be apprehended we rejoin Who has maintained that the soul is unknowable by perception? But soul is cognised by its juxta position with conjunctions with the internal organ else how such assurances as I am happy, I know, I desire I will, I am in pain? since such assurance is not without object or of doubtful object, for like an assurance of blueness &c it has a definite object Nor is it derived from argument for it arises without any knowledge of an argument Nor is it derived from verbal communication for it does not follow upon desire of such knowledge If it be maintained that it is a mere illusory perception, we reply that there must be some object not

merely apparent, for it will be shown in the sequel that that which is not an object of certain knowledge cannot be erroneously surmised in another object U

यदि दृष्टमन्वक्षमहं देवदत्तो ऽहं यज्ञदत्त इति ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 If the cognition I am Devadatta, I am Yajnadatta is a visual presentation [what need of any inference?]

[1] An opponent says If this be so what need of an inference? The word *iti* marks the form of the cognition and the word *drishta* ends in the affix *kta* used in a passive sense Presentation means perception The sense therefore is as follows If the perception which has for its form I am Devadatta I am Yajnadatta is *only* a perception what occasion is there for the trouble of making an inference? For on seeing an elephant those who infer do not infer him to be one from his screaming U

दृष्ट आत्मनि लिङ्गे एक एव दृढत्वात् प्रत्यक्षवत् प्रत्ययः ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 *If a mark of the existence of the soul were seen*, there could be but one assurance for it would be as evident as a percept

[2] The anticipated objection is refuted The sense as a whole is that if a mark of the soul s existence were observed or apprehend

---

[1] एवञ्चेत् किमनुमानेनेति पूर्वपक्षवादी आह । इति शब्दो ज्ञानप्रकारमाह दृष्टमिति भावे क्तप्रत्ययान्तम् अध्यक्षमित्यध्यक्षं समानार्थं अयं देवदत्त अयं यज्ञदत्त इति प्रकारकं दृष्टं दर्शनं अध्यक्षमेवास्ति यदि किमनुमानप्रयासेन न हि करिणि दृष्टे चीत्कारेण तमनुमिमते ऽनुमातारः ॥

[2] आशङ्कां निरस्यति । दृष्टे मनसा गृहीते आत्मनि लिङ्गे अनुमाने सति प्रत्यक्षवत् प्रत्यक्षसमानाकारक एक एव मुख्यस्य प्रत्ययः भवतीति शेषः मुख्यत्वं कुत दृढत्वात् अप्रामाण्यशङ्कानिवर्तनक्षमत्वात् मुख्यत्वञ्च गृहीतप्रामाण्यकत्वम् यथा दूरस्थे सरोवरादिसलिले दृष्टे ऽपि मरीचिकादिसाधारण्यात् तादृशप्रत्यक्षे ऽप्रामाण्यशङ्का उदेति ततो बलाकादिलिङ्गेन तदनुमाने सति तदनुमाने सति संवादेन तत्र प्रामाण्यग्रहात्तादृशशङ्का निवर्तते तथात्मनि दृष्टे ऽपि विपरीतसम्भावनादिना तज्ज्ञानाप्रामाण्यशङ्का सञ्जायते ततो ऽनुमानेनात्मनि गृहीते संवादेन तत्र प्रामाण्यग्रहादप्रामाण्यशङ्कानिवर्तनक्षमत्वरूपं दृढत्वं तादृशप्रत्यक्षस्य सुघटमेव तदुक्तं मिश्रैः प्रत्यक्षपरिकलितमप्यनुमानेन बुभुत्सन्ते तर्करसिका इति ॥

ed by the internal organ even were there an inference, there would be one and one only primary conviction, as in relation to a percept in the case of perception. *Whence its primary nature?* The being a primary conviction or being of recognised validity, results from its certitude or power of removing doubts of invalidity As for instance when the distant water of a lake &c has been seen, there arises a doubt as to the objective value of such a perception, there being a feeling of uncertainty whether it may not be a mirage or the like, and when afterwards there arises the inference from cranes &c the mark of its being a lake, the doubt ceases on the recognition of the evidence by means of reflection, so, although the soul is perceived a doubt arises as to the validity of the perception on account of counter probabilities &c., but afterwards the soul being inferentially cognised, the certitude of such cognition is easily demonstrated such certitude consisting of competency to re- *move suspicion of invalidity through the recognition in that case of* validity by means of argumentation It has accordingly been declared by the sage The logicians desire to understand by inference even that which is fully established by perception V

देवदत्तो गच्छति यज्ञदत्तो गच्छतीत्युपचाराच्छरीरे प्रत्ययः ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 The cognition Deva datta goes Yajna datta goes is applied tropically to the body[1]

[1] It may be objected that if the cognition I Yajna-datta refers to the soul a judgment of compatibility with motion such as Yajna datta goes is impossible It is therefore stated that there are such judgments as I am fair complexioned, I am stout, and there are such complex concepts as *my body* *Of these in the*

---

[1] ननु यदि यज्ञदत्तोऽहमिति प्रत्यय आत्मनि तदा यज्ञदत्तो गच्छतीति गमनसामानाधिकरण्यभानमनुपपन्नमित्यत आह । अस्ति हि अहं गौर अहं स्थूल इति प्रत्यय अस्ति च मम शरीरमिति भेदप्रत्यय तत्र देवदत्तो गच्छतीति गतिसामानाधिकरण्यानुभवो भक्त मर्मेति प्रत्ययस्य यथार्थत्वात् यद्यपि देवदत्तस्य शरीरवृत्तिर्जातिस्तेन देवदत्तो गच्छतीति मुख्य एव प्रयोगो यथार्थ एव च प्रत्यय तथापि देवदत्तपदं तदर्थच्छात्मनि प्रयुक्तश्चेत सदौपचारिको बोद्धव्य ॥

judgment Devadatta goes the conception and enouncement of compatibility with movement is *secondary*, whereas the expression mine is used in its primary application Although the nature of Deva-datta is a universal existing in the body and accordingly the expression Deva datta moves is correct even in its primary sense as also the judgment, if the term Deva datta be employed with regard to the soul determined thereby it is then to be understood in a secondary application U

[1] It may be asked how if such a notion as I Yajna-datta has the soul for its object the judgment Yajna datta goes can apply to the soul for the soul has not the power of motion It is therefore stated that the sense conveyed by the proposition Deva datta goes arises from the observation that the word Deva-datta implies corporeality Since such propositions as Deva datta knows wishes acts hates &c *are used in their primary sense the term Deva datta* must have the power of denoting a soul appropriated to a determinate body For as in the meaning of these propositions there is a manifold application the complication of this hypothesis is inoperative i e does not invalidate it and it may be considered that the primary sense possibly belongs to such application to the pression of volition in the proposition He goes V

सन्दिग्धस्तूपचारः ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 The secondary application however is doubted

[2] The word however indicates the view of an opponent The *name and notion of the Ego are known to relate both to the soul*

[1] नन्वह यज्ञदत्त इत्यादिप्रत्यय यद्यात्मविषयकं तदा यज्ञदत्तो गच्छतीति प्रत्यय कथं स्यादात्मनि गतिमत्त्वाभावादित्यत आह । देवदत्तो गच्छतीति प्रत्ययश्च देवदत्तादिपदस्य शरीरे लक्षणाग्रहादुत्पन्न देवदत्तो जानाति इच्छति करोति द्वेष्टीत्यादिप्रयोगाणां मुख्यतया देवदत्तादिपदस्य विजातीयशरीरावच्छिन्नात्मनि शक्तिरावश्यकी तथाच ... गौरवस्याकिञ्चित्करत्वात् ... गच्छतीत्यत्राप्यात्मनि ... फलं ... मुख्यत्वमपि सम्भवतीत्यपि द्रष्टव्यम् ॥

[2] तुशब्द पूर्वपक्षद्योतक । आत्मशरीरयोरहमिति प्रत्यय प्रयोगश्च दृश्यते तत्र कः मुख्य कः औपचारिक इति सन्देह ॥

and the body The doubt in this case is which is the primary and which the secondary application U

अहमिति प्रत्यगात्मनि भावात् परत्राभावादर्थान्तरप्रत्यक्षः ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 The cognition of the Ego is a perception of a distinctive entity, since it applies to self reflective soul, and not to aught else

[1] A presentation in which a distinctive entity of the nature of soul is given, is a perception of a distinctive entity The meaning is as follows Since the presentation of the Ego is relative to one's own soul, and not to another's it is proper to regard the reference to the distinctive entity, i e to one's own soul, as primary If, on the other hand, the primary reference were to the body, the notion would be produced by the external organs of sense, for the body is not an object of internal perception, and the presentation of the Ego is subjective being produced without any operation of the external organs of sense Such cognitions as I am sorry, I am glad I know, I will, I wish, arise from the internal sensory viewing as its object the soul accompanied with its perceptible discriminative attributes. Such a cognition is not inferential, being produced without

[1] अर्थान्तरात्मस्वरूपं प्रत्यक्षं यत्र प्रत्ययो स प्रत्ययो ऽर्थान्तरप्रत्यक्ष अयमर्थः अहमिति प्रत्ययस्य प्रत्यगात्मनि स्वात्मनि भावात् परत्र परात्मनि अभावात् अर्थान्तरे स्वात्मन्येव मुख्यः अभ्युपगन्तुमुचितः यदि तु शरीरे मुख्यः स्यात् तदा बहिरिन्द्रियजः स्यात् न हि शरीरं मानसप्रत्यक्षं मानसप्रत्यक्षमहमिति प्रत्ययः बहिरिन्द्रियव्यापारमन्तरेणापि जायमानत्वात् अहं दुःखी अहं सुखी जाने यते इच्छाम्यहमिति योग्यविशेषगुणोपहितस्यात्मनो मनसा विषयीकरणात् नापि लैङ्गिको लिङ्गानुसन्धानमन्तरेणापि जायमानत्वात् न शाब्दः शब्दाकर्णनमन्तरेणापि जायमानत्वात् तस्मादात्मन एव मम शरीरमिति व्यतिरेकस्याप्यनुभवात् शरीराद्यवच्छेदेनैव भानमिति भावः । किञ्च यदि शरीरे स्यात् परशरीरे स्यात् स्वात्मनि यदि स्यात् तदा परात्मनि स्यादिति चेत् परात्मनः परस्यातीन्द्रियत्वात् तद्वृत्तिगुणानामयोग्यत्वात् योग्यविशेषगुणोपधानेन तस्य योग्यत्वात् न चैवम् मानसत्वं एवं सति किन्तु द्रव्यमात्रस्य द्रव्यं हि योग्यविशेषगुणोपधानेनैव प्रत्यक्षं भवति आकाशमपि सति शब्दोपधानेन प्रत्यक्षं स्यादिति चेत् स्यादेवं यदि चेत् द्रव्यप्रत्यक्षे महत्त्वम् आकाशे वा रूपवत्त्वं स्यात् आत्मनो ऽपि नीरूपस्य कुतस्त्यमिति चेत् बहिरिन्द्रियमात्र एव रूपवत्त्वं न तु मनसस्तन्त्रत्वात् प्रत्यक्षमात्रे उद्भूतमहत्त्वस्यानुगमात् ॥

seeking any mark of concomitance. It is not verbally communicated, being produced without reflection on words It, therefore, belongs to the internal organ, and to the internal organ independent of the external organs, not being concerned with the body &c Moreover if it be urged that if it referred to the body it would refer to the bodies of others and if it be referred to one's own soul it would refer to the souls of others, we deny this, for the soul of one man is beyond the senses of another, since its particular attributes cannot be externally perceived and the soul itself could be perceived only by apprehension of particular attributes appropriate to the several senses Nor is this the nature of soul only, but of all substances for substance becomes perceptible by apprehension of particular attributes appropriate to the several senses If you rejoin that on this ground ether also should be perceptible by the apprehension of sound, we reply that such would be the case were the organ of hearing capable of apprehending a substance or if ether possessed colour If you object that the soul is equally devoid of colour, we reply that it is in the case of external substances only that possession of colour is a requisite with regard to perceptibility U

¹ The cognition of the Ego and the expressions I Yajna datta am happy &c, are the cognitions of a distinctive object, the perception or presentation of an ulterior object of one different from the body &c, since they produce verbal information the object of which is different from the body Such is the sense resulting from the aphorism The application accordingly, to the soul as to something ulterior to the body is primary that to the body is secondary Why so? The answer is because of existence viz, the existence of pleasure &c in one's own soul and because of non

¹ अहमितीति अहं यज्ञदत्तः सुखीत्यादिव्यवहारः अर्थान्तरप्रत्यक्षः अर्थान्तरस्य शरीरादिभिन्नस्य प्रत्यक्षं ज्ञानं यस्मात् शरीरादिभिन्नविषयकशाब्दबोधजनक इति फलितार्थः तथा च शरीरादिभिन्न एवात्मनि तादृशप्रयोगो मुख्यः शरीरे त्वौपचारिकः कुत एवमत आह प्रत्यगात्मनि स्वात्मनि भावात् अर्थात् सुखादेः सत्त्वात् परत्र शरीरे अभावात् सुखादेरसत्त्वात् तथा च भूरिप्रयोगस्यात्मन्येव सत्त्वात्तत्रैव तादृशप्रयोगस्य मुख्यत्वं शरीरादावौपचारिकत्वमिति न सन्देहगन्धोऽपीति ॥

[1] The word knowledge tacitly indicates the attributes of soul sensible pleasure, pain and the like As the bodies of Yajna-datta and Vishnu mitra are separate from one another, so are their knowledge, pleasure and the like separate Accordingly as the cognition This is Yajna-datta's body, is an object, so, though no knowledge, pleasure &c be produced in Yajna-datta, the cognitions I feel pleasure, I know, I will, I wish will be objects, because, the body being an object to the appropriate senses, its knowledge &c, like its colour &c, may be perceptible But this is impossible Therefore there is, such is the meaning, to be maintained a subject of knowledge, pleasure and the like, other than the body U

[2] The knowledge of Yajna datta and Vishnu mitra does not in consequence of the difference of their bodies, in consequence, that is, of their bodies being different objects, become an object, during the perception of the body The word knowledge implies generally all the particular sensible attributes of the soul Therefore, as in our presentation of soul &c knowledge &c is the object, it being universally allowed that there are such cognitions as I know, I wish, I will, I feel pleasure I am in pain, I hate &c., so would there be in like manner were the body denoted by the word I, and did it possess the attributes knowledge &c, a cognition of knowledge &c even in the visual perception of body But no one

---

[1] ज्ञानमिति योग्य सुखदु खादिकमात्मगुणमुपलक्षयति यथा यज्ञदत्तविष्णुमित्रयोः शरीरं परस्परभिन्नं तथा ज्ञानसुखादिकमपि भिन्नमेव तथा च यथा यज्ञदत्तस्येदं शरीरं तथा यज्ञदत्तस्य ज्ञाने सुखादौ वा ऽनुत्पन्ने ऽहं सुखी जाने यते इच्छामीति ज्ञानादिकं विषयो भवति योग्यशरीरविषयकत्वेन तदीयरूपादिवत्तदीयज्ञानादीनामपि प्रत्यक्षसम्भवात् न च सम्भवति तस्मात् ज्ञानसुखादीनां शरीरादन्य एवाश्रयो वक्तव्य इति भाव ॥

[2] न तु न हि शरीरविशेषात् शरीरविशेषविषयकत्वात् यज्ञदत्तविष्णुमित्रयोर्ज्ञानमपि विषयो भवति शरीरसाक्षात्कारे इत्यर्थः ज्ञानपद योग्यात्मविशेषगुणसामान्यपरम् तथा च यथास्माकमात्मसाक्षात्कारे ज्ञानादिकं विषयो भवति अहं जानामि इच्छामि यते सुखी दुःखी द्वेष्मीत्याद्यनुभवस्य सर्वसिद्धत्वात् तथा शरीरचाक्षुषादावपि ज्ञानादेर्भानं स्यात् यदि शरीरमहम्पदवाच्यं ज्ञानादिगुणकञ्च स्यात् न हि स्थूलो यज्ञदत्तो ऽहं जानामीति चाक्षुषप्रत्यक्षं कस्यचिद्भवति तस्माच्छरीरे ऽहमादिव्यवहार औपचारिक एवेति नास्मत्प्रतिज्ञाहानिरिति भाव ॥

has a visual presentative cognition in the form I the stout Yajna-datta, know Therefore the use of the words I &c in reference to the body is only by a secondary application, and accordingly we do not surrender the matter of our thesis V

अहमिति मुख्ययोग्याभ्यां शब्दवद्व्यतिरेकाव्यभिचाराद्विशेषसिद्धेर्नागमिकः ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 The knowledge of the Ego being individually established like sound as *a conditio sine quâ non* neither too narrowly nor too widely affirmed by its predominant and sensible attributes, does not depend upon revelation

[1] The following objection might be raised. The soul is not an object of perception since like ether, it is a colourless or a simple substance Of the cognition I am thin or pale the body must be affirmed to be the object. Whereas there is sometimes the judgment I feel pleasure &c *it is proper to suppose that* pleasure and the like, becoming manifest without their substratum are

[1] नन्वात्मा न प्रत्यक्षः नीरूपद्रव्यत्वात् निरवयवद्रव्यत्वाद्वा आकाशवत् तथाचाहं कृशो गौर इति बुद्धेः शरीरमेव विषयो वाच्यः क्वचिदहं सुखीत्यादि धीरपि यद्यप्यस्ति तथाप्याश्रयमन्तरेण भासमानानां दुःखादीनां शरीरे समारोप इत्येव कल्पयितुमुचितम् यथोष्णं सुरभिजलम् इत्याश्रयमन्तरेण प्रतीयमानयोरौष्ण्यसौरभयोर्जले समारोपः न चैतदनुरोधेन जलप्रत्ययस्यापि प्रसिद्धजलमन्तरेणान्यविषयत्वम् तथा अहमित्यस्याप्यहन्त्वं शरीर एव वास्तवम् सुखादिकन्तु कदाचित् तत्रारोप्यते तेनात्मनि प्रत्यक्षाकारं ज्ञानं नास्त्येव सुखाद्याधारत्वेन यत्कल्पनीयं तदागमसिद्धं भवतु न तत्रापि वह इत्यत आह। अयमर्थः अहं दुःखीति प्रत्ययो नागमिको न शाब्दो नापि लैङ्गिकः शब्दलिङ्गयोरन्तरेणापि जायमानत्वात् प्रत्यक्षत्वे च नीरूपत्वं निरवयवत्वञ्च यद्बाधकमुक्तं तद्बहिरिन्द्रियप्रत्यक्षतायां भवति तत्र हि रूपवत्त्वानेकद्रव्यवत्त्वयोः प्रयोजकत्वात् मानसप्रत्यक्षता च तदन्तरेणापि। ननु स्यादेव यद्यात्मनि प्रमाणं स्यात् तदेव तु नास्तीत्यत आह शब्दवद्व्यतिरेकाव्यभिचाराद्विशेषसिद्धेरिति यथा क्षित्यादिषु द्रव्येषु शब्दस्य व्यतिरेको ऽव्यभिचारी नियतस्तेन तदाश्रयतयाष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तस्याकाशरूपस्य विशेषस्य सिद्धिः एवमिच्छाया पृथिव्यादिषु व्यतिरेकस्याव्यभिचारात् तदाश्रयेणापि अष्टद्रव्यातिरिक्तेन भवितव्यम्। नन्वेतावता ह्यानुमानिक एव आत्मा न तु प्रत्यक्ष इत्यत आह अहमिति मुख्ययोग्याभ्यामिति अहमित्यविकारेण ज्ञानाकारमाह तेन सिद्धमिति ज्ञानं शब्दलिङ्गानुसन्धानमन्तरेण निमीलिताक्षस्य यदुत्पद्यते तन्मुख्येन अहन्त्वयता योग्येन प्रमाणसिद्धेन उपपादनीयम् न तु शरीरादिना तत्रेच्छाया व्यतिरेकाव्यभिचारात् मुख्ययोग्याभ्यामित्यनन्तरम् उपपादनीयमिति पूरणीयम् आत्मनि प्रमाणानि बहूनि अन्यैरपि व्यक्तानि मयूखे ऽन्वेष्टव्यानि॥

attributed by metaphor to the body as in the notion Hot fragrant water, heat and fragrance appearing without a substratum, are metaphorically attributed to water But in this case there being such attribution in the notion of water there is not another *object independent of common* water *In the case therefore* of the Ego, the notion I is real only in reference to the body but pleasure and the like are sometimes metaphorically attributed to the body There is then with reference to soul, no knowledge of it in the form of perception That then which we must assume as the substratum of pleasure and the like must be established by revelation There is no means of directly cognising it The reply to this objection is the following The cognition I feel pleasure I am in pain is not by revelation by verbal communication or by inference for it arises independently of any attention to words or arguments. Whereas it has been said that colourlessness and simplicity are preventive of perception this holds true only in the case of perception by the external organs for of this the possession of colour, and the existence of a plurality of substances are the necessary conditions Internal perception is independent of these conditions It may be objected that this would be the case were there any proof of the existence of the soul but there is none. *Accordingly the* words Being individually established like sound as a *conditio sine quâ non* neither too narrowly nor too widely affirmed. As sound as a *conditio sine quâ non* is not unduly restricted or extended so as to apply to the substances earth &c, and is decisive and there is thereby proof of a particular substance, viz ether as excluded from other eight substances, as the substratum of sound in like manner since the exclusive argument from desire does not fail by applicability to earth &c. the substratum of desire must be excluded from other eight substances Lest it be argued that all this shows that the soul is an object of inference not an object of perception the words The knowledge of the Ego from its predominant and sensible attributes are employed By the particle *iti*

the form of the cognition is stated The knowledge of the Ego therefore which arises independently of any attention to words or arguments, in one whose eyes are closed must be produced by an original attribute of egoity, sensible or established by proof, but is not produced by the body, inasmuch as the exclusive argument from desire does not fail by applicability to it After the words From its predominant and sensible attributes, the words To be established are to be supplied Many proofs of the existence of soul omitted for fear of encumbering this treatise should be sought in the Mayúkha U

¹ The Vedántins maintain that soul is nothing but eternal knowledge, according to the sacred text This imperishable soul is true knowledge the infinite supreme spirit and that in the course of thing being divided by the products of illusion the accidents of the form of the internal organ it appears manifold, according to such texts as One only without a second One moreover, the inmost soul of all beings, became the counterpart of every

¹ वेदान्तिनस्तु नित्यविज्ञानमेवात्मा अविनाशी वा अरे ऽयमात्मा सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म इति श्रुतेः स च वस्तुगत्या एको ऽपि मायाकार्याणामन्तःकरणरूपोपाधीनां भेदान्नानेव प्रतिभाति एकमेवाद्वितीयम् इति एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव इत्यादिश्रुतेरित्याहुस्तन्मतं दूषयति । अहमितीति प्रत्यक्षविषय इति शेषः तथा चाह सुखीत्यादिलौकिकमानसप्रत्यक्षविषयः न आगमिकः सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म इत्याद्यागमप्रतिपाद्येश्वराभिन्नः अत्र हेतुमाह सुखयोगाभ्यामित्यादि सुख सत यद्योग सुखं दुःखञ्च ताभ्यां विशेषसिद्धेरीश्वरभेदसिद्धेः इष्टेषु सुखस्य सुखत्वं अन्येच्छानधीनेच्छाविषयत्वात् दुःखस्य तु द्विष्टेषु सुखत्वम् अन्यद्वेषानधीनद्वेषविषयत्वात् योगत्वञ्च प्रत्यक्षविषयत्वम् एतत्कथनञ्च ईश्वरसिद्धिशङ्कानिरासार्थम् ईश्वरे नित्यसुखाङ्गीकारपक्षे व्यभिचारवारणार्थञ्च नित्यसुखस्यायोग्यत्वात् तथा च जन्यसुखदुःखञ्च जीवस्येश्वरभेदसाधकम् । उपलक्षणञ्चैतत् जन्या ज्ञानेच्छायत्ना द्वेषश्च ईश्वरभेदसाधका द्रष्टव्याः । ननु अहमिति प्रत्यक्षविषय आत्मा ईश्वरभिन्नः जन्यसुखवत्त्वादित्यादौ दृष्टान्ताभावेन अन्वयसहचाराग्रहात् व्याप्तिज्ञानं दुर्घटमत उक्तं व्यतिरेकाव्यभिचारादिति व्यतिरेकव्याप्तेरित्यर्थः प्रयोज्यत्वं पञ्चम्यर्थस्तस्य च विशेषसिद्धावन्वयः तथाचान्वयदृष्टान्ताभावे ऽपि व्यतिरेकेण ईश्वरस्य दृष्टान्तत्वसम्भवेन व्यतिरेकसहचारग्रहाधीनव्यतिरेकव्याप्तिघटादेवोक्तस्थले ऽनुमितिः सम्भवतीति भावः ननु व्यतिरेकव्याप्त्येश्वरभेदसाधकत्वं न दृष्टचरमित्याशङ्कानिरासायोक्तं शब्दवदिति शब्दादिवेत्यर्थः आकाशस्य यथा शब्दरूपाद्धेतोर्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिप्रकारेण ज्ञायमानादीश्वरभेदसिद्धिस्तथात्मनो जन्यसुखादिमत्त्वात् तत्सिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

form This doctrine is here refuted After The knowledge of the Ego, the words Is the object of perception, are to be supplied The object therefore of such common internal perceptions as I am happy, is not proved by revelation and inseparable from God who is declared in such texts as, True knowledge, the infinite supreme spirit The reason of this is stated in the words From its predominant and sensible attributes &c because of the proof of particularity, i e because of the proof of separateness from God, by that which is predominant and sensible, i e by pleasure and pain. Pleasure is among objects of desire predominant, because it is the object of desire not dependent on other desires, and pain is predominant among objects of aversion because it is the object of aversion not dependent on other aversions Appropriateness is the being an object of perception This is mentioned to remove doubt as to absence of proof of the argument, and to prevent a fallacious application in case of the assumption of eternal bliss in reference to God for eternal bliss is not appropriate, and consequently generated pleasure and pain is the proof of the difference between the individual soul and God This generated pleasure and pain implies something more, and generated knowledge, desire, volition, and aversion are to be regarded as proofs of the separateness of the individual soul and God It may be urged that in such arguments as The soul, the object of the perception of the Ego is different from God because it possesses generated pleasure &c there being no example and consequently no observation of congruity of similar instances with the universal affirmation, the knowledge of a universal concomitance is impossible. Hence the words As a *conditio sine quâ non* neither too narrowly nor too widely affirmed, that is because of the universality of the exclusion The conditions necessary to the proof may be universally affirmed in the proof of the particular. Though, therefore, there be no example of the universal affirmation, since by exclusion God may be the example, an inference with respect to the matter in hand is possible through observation of a uni-

versal exclusion dependent on observation of concomitance with exclusion To remove the doubt that the proof by a universally exclusive argument of the separateness from God is not applicable the words Like sound are added meaning As is the case with sound and the like. As ether is proved to exist by its mark viz sound which is known by means of the form of universal exclusion, so the proof of the separateness of the *individual soul from God* is from the possession by the soul of generated pleasure &c V

Alleged unity of soul. सुखदुःखज्ञाननिष्पत्त्यविशेषादैकात्म्यम् ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 Because of the indifference of the origin of pleasure pain and knowledge soul is one

[1] The section treating of the investigation of soul being completed *that treating of the plurality of souls is commenced* This aphorism sets forth an adverse doctrine There is according to this doctrine but one soul though the bodies of Chaitra Maitra and others be numerically diverse Why? Because of the indifference of the origin of pleasure pain and knowledge since *the origin of pleasure pain and knowledge as determined by all* bodies is not particular If there were another mark probative of the separateness of the soul its separateness might be proved but there is not, just as in the production of sound as determined in such and such places its mark sound being non particular ether is one, *as its mark the notions of simultaneity &c* being non particular time is one and as its mark the notions of posteriority and priority being non particular space is one U

Plurality of souls. व्यवस्थातो नाना ॥ २० ॥

Aph. 20 Because of its circumstances soul is manifold

[1] आत्मपरीक्षाप्रकरणं समाप्य इदानीमात्मनानात्वप्रकरणमारभते, तत्र पूर्वपक्षसूत्रम् । एक एव आत्मा चैत्रमैत्रादिदेहभेदेऽपि कुतः सुखदुःखज्ञानानां निष्पत्त्यविशेषात् सर्वशरीरावच्छेदेन सुखदुःखज्ञानानामुत्पत्तिरविशिष्टैव यतः । यद्यात्मभेदसाधकं लिङ्गान्तरं भवेत् तदा सिध्येदात्मभेदः न च तदस्ति यथा तत्तत्प्रदेशावच्छेदेन शब्दनिष्पत्तावपि शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषादेक एव आकाशः पूर्वापरादिप्रत्ययलिङ्गाविशेषादेकैव दिक् ॥

I

[1] The doctrine is stated that souls are manifold Why? Because of their *circumstances* Circumstances are the several conditions as one is rich, another mean one is happy another unhappy, one is of high another of low birth one is learned, another reads badly These circumstances being impossible without a diversity of souls evince a plurality of souls It cannot be maintained that as are the circumstances of one soul due to various states of being to childhood youth and old age so are the circumstances of one soul in the divers bodies of Chaitra Maitra &c for it is by difference of time only that the existence in one subject of contradictory attributes is possible U

शास्त्रसामर्थ्याच्च ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 And on the authority of the Śástra

[2] The Śástra means revelation (Sruti) For, in the declaration of diversity of soul, it is revealed that Two spirits are to be known &c. U

FOURTH BOOK FIRST DAILY LESSON

सदकारणवन्नित्यम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 The eternal is existent and uncaused

[3] Some say that the existent is produced from the non existent.

---

[1] सिद्धान्तमाह नाना आत्मान कुत व्यवस्थात व्यवस्था प्रतिनियम यथा कश्चिदाढ्य कश्चिद्दरिद्र कश्चित सुखी कश्चिद्दुःखी कश्चिदुच्चाभिजन कश्चिन्नीचाभिजन कश्चिद्विद्वान् कश्चित् जाल्म इतीय व्यवस्था आत्मभेदमन्तरेणानुपपद्यमाना साधयत्यात्मना भेदम् न च जन्मभेदेन बाल्यकौमारवार्धक्यभेदेन वा एकस्याप्यात्मनो यथा व्यवस्था तथा चैत्रमैत्रादिदेहभेदे ऽपि स्यादिति वाच्य कालभेदेन विरुद्धधर्माध्यासम्भवात् ॥

[2] शास्त्र श्रुति तयाप्यात्मनो भेदप्रतिपादनात् श्रूयते हि द्वे ब्रह्मणी वेदितव्ये इत्यादि ॥

[3] असत सज्जायते इति केचिद्वदन्ति तेषामयमभिप्राय बीजादिनाङ्कुरादिकार्यंजनक तथा सति कुशूलस्थबीजादेरप्यङ्कुराद्युत्पत्ते किन्तु क्षेत्रादौ स्थितस्य बीजस्यावयवविभागेन प्रध्वसानन्तरमेवाङ्कुरोत्पादात बीजादिप्रध्वस एवाङ्कुरादे कारणमिति तथा च गौतमीय पूर्वपक्षसूत्रम अभावाद्भावोत्पत्तिर्नानुपमृद्य प्रादुर्भावात् इति तदेतन्मत निराकुर्वन्न परमाण्वादिक्रमेण सवाद दर्शयति । सत भावरूप किञ्चित अकारणवत अजन्य नित्य विनाशाप्रतियोगिवस्तु अवयविना मूलकारणं नासत् इत्यर्थ प्रध्वसस्य कारणत्वे पूर्वोक्तत्वादपि बीजादङ्कुरापत्तिरिति भाव ॥

Their view is as follows A seed &c is not productive of a sprout &c as its effect for were this the case there would be produced a sprout &c from a seed &c in a granary But inasmuch as the shoot is produced after the destruction of the seed when sown, by the disjunction of its constituent parts it is the destruction of the seed &c which is the cause of the sprout &c Accordingly the aphorism of Gautama enunciatory of an adverse doctrine From non-existence is production of existence for without destruction is no manifestation In refutation of this doctrine a prefatory discourse is set up treating of atoms &c The existent means anything which is, uncaused, unproduced, the eternal matter which does not by destruction cease to exist The sense is that the primary cause of integrate wholes is not the non existent, for were destruction or subsequent non existence the cause a sprout would be produced even from a seed which had been ground into meal V

तस्य कार्यं लिङ्गम ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 *The effect thereof is the mark of its existence*

[1] Thereof—of an atom—an effect or product a water pot or the like is the mark of existence Accordingly the aphorism of Gautama *From the evolved is the production of the evolved, on the evidence of perception* Thus is the sequence of integrant and integrate wholes If this series were unlimited there would be no

---

[1] तस्य परमाणोः कार्यं घटादि लिङ्गम तथा च गौतमीयं सूत्र व्यक्तात व्यक्तस्य निष्पत्तिः प्रत्यक्षप्रामाण्यात् इति अवयवावयविप्रसङ्गस्तावदनुभूयते स यदि निरवधि स्यात् तदा मेरुसर्षपयोः परिमाणभेदो न स्यात् अनन्तावयवारब्धत्वाविशेषात् न च परिमाणप्रचयविशेषाधीनो विशेष स्यादिति वाच्य सख्याविशेषाभावात् तयोरप्यनुपपत्तेः अन्त्यावधि स्यादिति चेत अन्त्यस्य कस्यचिन्निरवयवत्वे प्रलयस्यैवानुपपत्तेः अवयवविभागविनाशाभ्यामेव द्रव्यनाशस्यात् विभागश्च नावधिः तस्यैकाश्रयत्वानुपपत्तेः तस्मान्निरवयव द्रव्यमवधि स एव परमाणुः न च त्रसरेणुरेवावधिः तस्य चाक्षुषद्रव्यत्वेन महत्त्वादनेक द्रव्यवत्त्वाच्च महत्त्वस्य चाक्षुषप्रत्यक्षत्वे कारणत्वम् अनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वमादायैव अन्यथा महत्त्वमेव न स्यात कस्य कारणस्य भवेत न च त्रसरेणोरवयवा एव परमाणवः महद्द्रव्यारम्भकत्वेन तेषामपि सावयवत्वानुमानात् तन्तुवत् कपालवच्च तस्मात यत् कार्यद्रव्य तत् सावयव यच्च सावयव तत् कार्यं द्रव्यम तथा च यतो ऽवयवात् कार्यत्व निवर्तते सच सावयवत्वमपीति निरवयवपरमाणुसिद्धिः ॥

difference in size between mount Meru and a grain of mustard seed for they would both be indifferently originated by an infinity of parts Nor can it be argued that the difference depends on an aggregation of extensions for without a difference of number they would be impossible If it be said that annihilation may be the limit of the series of integrant and integrate bodies we object that there existing *indivisibility in some ultimate element annihilation* is impossible for it is only disjunction of its constituent parts or decomposition that it can destroy matter Nor is disjunction the limit for it is impossible that it should reside in a single object A substance therefore without parts, must be the limit and this is an atom A mote is not the limit for a mote has magnitude and is composed of substances more than one, being a visible substance For magnitude is a condition of visual perception, only as it presupposes multiplicity of substance Else magnitude would not exist and what would be the cause? Nor are the constituent parts of a mote atoms, for we must infer that those constituent parts as *originative of a substance possessing magnitude are composed* of parts like threads or the halves of water pots Therefore what ever is a generated substance is composed of parts and whatever is *composed of parts is a produced substance* In whatever part then there ceases to be the nature of a product there ceases also to be that of containing parts and this is the proof of the existence of invisible atoms *U*

¹ Thereof means of the primary cause, the effect a mote or other produced substance the mark that which determines an inference If the series of integrant and integrate wholes were end_

¹ तस्य मूलकारणस्य कार्यं त्रसरेण्वादिकार्यद्रव्यम् लिङ्गमनुमापकम् तथाहि अवयवावयविधाराया अनन्तत्वे मेरुसर्षपयोरपि साम्यप्रसङ्ग अनन्तावयवारब्धत्वाविशेषात् अत क्वचिद्विश्रामो वाच्य न च त्रसरेणौ विश्राम त्रसरेणु सावयव चाक्षुषद्रव्यत्वात् घटवदित्यनुमानेन द्व्यणुकरूपतदवयवसिद्धे नापि द्व्यणुक एव विश्राम त्रसरेणोरवयवा सावयवा महदवयवत्वात् कपालवदित्यनुमानेन द्व्यणुकावयवस्य परमाणुरूपस्य मूलकारणस्य सिद्धे न चैव क्रमेण तदवयवधारापि सिध्येत अनवस्थाभयेनानुकूलतर्काभावेन च तत्कल्पनाया असम्भवात् ॥

less, it would follow that Meru and a grain of mustard seed would be equal, inasmuch as they would both indifferently originate in an infinity of constituent parts We must therefore allow a termination at some point But the termination cannot be in a mote inasmuch as it is proved to have parts viz binary atomic aggregates according to the inference that a mote has parts, for it is a visible substance like a water pot Nor can the series terminate in binary atomic aggregates for by the inference that the constituent parts of a mote must have parts, because they are parts possessed of magnitude, like the halves of a water pot, it is proved that of an aggregate of two atoms there is a part an atom as the primary material cause It cannot in a like order be proved that this has a series of parts, for the hypothesis is impossible involving an infinite regression and wanting confirmatory circumstances | V

कारणभावात् कार्यभावः ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 From existence of the cause is existence of the effect

[1] From the existence of colour &c in the cause results its existence in the effect, for the qualities of the cause are antecedent to those of the effect as is observed in the case of a waterpot, a piece of cloth, and the like U

[2] *From the existence of the cause of the primary cause results the existence or being of the effects compound substances* Otherwise as the material cause of earth is earthy it would in like manner follow that, by having the non existent for a material cause, no product or complex whole would exist V

अनित्य इति विशेषतः प्रतिषेधभावः ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 The negation Non eternal is of the particular

---

[1] रूपादीनां कारणे सद्भावात् कार्ये सद्भावः कारणगुणपूर्वका हि कार्यगुणा भवन्ति घटादौ तथा दर्शनादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] कारणस्य मूलकारणस्य भावात् कार्याणाम् अवयविनां भावः सत्ता अन्यथा मृदुपादानकस्य मृन्मयत्वात् असदुपादानकत्वेन कार्याणामवयविनामसत्त्वप्रसङ्गादित्यर्थः ॥

[1] The negation Non eternal is of the particular relates to particular things and hence arises the negation A compound substance is not eternal" But a universal negation Every thing is not eternal is impossible V

अविद्या ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 [The supposition that atoms are non eternal is] nescience

[2] The following objections may be raised. An atom is not eternal for it is matter like a water pot Similarly the possession of colour taste &c may be adduced as arguments So also by simultaneous conjunction with six other atoms an atom has six facets or parts, and consequently *from its possession of parts and from its* being the substratum of conjunction partially inherent we may infer that atoms are non eternal Moreover if there be ether inside an atom then inasmuch as it has an interior it has parts, but if there be not ether inside an atom it follows that ether is not omnipresent

Also the non eternity of an atom follows from the inference which establishes the doctrine of transitoriness that whatever is is momentary If then there be such a series of inferences how can it be maintained that an atom is eternal? The answer is as follows Every inference having for its object the non eternity of an atom is nescience in the form of error since it springs from a fallacy This fallacy is occasionally prevention of proof including the subject al

---

[1] न नित्य इति प्रतिषेधस्य भावो भवन् विशेषत वस्तुविशेषमाश्रित्य तथाभाव यथो न नित्य इति प्रतिषेधो भवति न तु सर्वे पदार्था न नित्या इति सामान्यतः प्रतिषेध सम्भवति ॥

[2] ननु परमाणुर्नित्य मूर्तत्वात् घटवत् एवं रूपवत्त्वरसवत्त्वादय प्रत्येकं हेतव ऊह्याः एवं षट्केन युगपद्योगात् परमाणोः षडंशता तथा च सावयवत्वात् अव्याप्यवृत्ति संयोगाश्रयत्वात् । किञ्च परमाणोर्मध्ये यद्याकाशमस्ति तदा सच्छिद्रत्वेनैव सावयवत्वम् अथ नास्ति तदाकाशस्यासर्वगतत्वप्रसङ्ग । अपि च यत् सत् तत् क्षणिकमित्यादिबौद्ध पक्षसाधकानुमानादपि परमाणोरनित्यता तथा चैतावतो चेदनुमानपरम्परा तदा कथ मुच्यते परमाणुर्नित्य इत्यत आह । परमाणोरनित्यत्वविषया सर्वाप्यनुमिति अविद्या भ्रमरूपा आभासप्रभवत्वात् आभासता धर्मिग्राहकप्रमाणबाध सर्वत्र विपक्षबाधकप्रमा णाभावस्याप्राप्यत्वासिद्धि क्वचित् स्वरूपासिद्धिरित्यादि समानतन्त्रे ऽन्वेष्टव्यम् ॥

ways absence of proof of inclusion due to want of evidence preventive of contrary instances; sometimes absence of proof as to the predicate. This and other matters may be sought in the Samánatantra U.

[1] Nescience is want of proof, viz the inference of non-eternity of sound; for it arises from a fallacy, inasmuch as all the aforesaid arguments are vitiated by plurality of consequents V.

Conditions of perception

महत्यनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वात् रूपाच्चोपलब्धिः ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Perception is of the great, in consequence of its containing substances more than one, and in consequence of colour.

[2] Perception—visual and tactual presentation—takes place (for these words are to be supplied) in relation to the great, that is, *in relation to that which has great extension*. *There is, accordingly, no perception of an atom inasmuch as it has no magnitude*. It might be asked why there is no perception of air &c, there being great extension; accordingly the words In consequence of colour,—that is in consequence of appreciable colour, and thus though there be colour in the eye &c, there is no perception of it. It might be asked how there exists magnitude in a mote whereas there is none in an atom, accordingly the words In consequence of its containing substances more than one. {Since then containing substances more than one *is the positive condition with regard to* produced magnitude, and this does not exist in an atom &c, magnitude does not exist in an atom,}&c The containing substances more than one is the being a a substratum in which a plurality of substances co-inhere V

---

[1] अविद्या अप्रमा अर्थात् परमाणोरनित्यत्वानुमितिः दुष्टहेतुजन्यत्वात् पूर्वोक्तानां हेतूनामनैकान्तिकत्वादिति भावः ॥

[2] उपलब्धिः चाक्षुषं स्पार्शनञ्च प्रत्यक्षम् महति महत्परिमाणवति भवतीति शेषः तथा च परमाणोर्महत्त्वाभावान्न प्रत्यक्षमिति भावः । ननु वाय्वादेरपि महत्परिमाणत्वात् कथं न प्रत्यक्षमत उक्तं रूपादिति उद्भूतरूपादित्यर्थः तेन चक्षुरादौ रूपसत्त्वेऽपि न प्रत्यक्षम् ननु त्रसरेण्वादावेव कथं महत्त्वं न परमाण्वादिष्वत उक्तम् अनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वादिति तथा च जन्यमहत्त्वं प्रति अनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वस्य प्रयोजकत्वात् परमाण्वादौ च तदभावान्न महत्त्वम् अनेकद्रव्यवत्त्वञ्च अनेकसमवेतसमवेतत्वमिति ॥

सत्यपि द्रव्यत्वे महत्त्वे रूपसंस्काराभावाद्वायोरनुपलब्धिः ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 The non perception of air, though there be therein substantiality and magnitude is in consequence of the non existence of the impression of colour

[1] Such being the case there should, it may be urged, also be perception of the light of a torch at midday or of the light of the eye in which colour inheres in consequence of the inhesion of touch and which has magnitude The answer is as follows —By the term impression of colour is intended inhesion or appreciability or non obscuration of colour Though therefore the selfsame inhesion in air of touch is inhesion of colour, yet it is not qualified by colour, for there is in it absolute non existence of colour In the light of the eye there is no impression that is no appreciability, of colour In the light of the torch at midday there is no impression, that is no non obscuration of colour Of these, therefore there is no perceptibility In like manner impression of colour is to be analogously applied to the hot season heat or fire within a cooking utensil gold &c U

[2] Impression of colour, or impressed colour (according to the

---

[1] नन्वेवमपि मध्यन्दिनोल्काप्रकाशस्य चाक्षुषस्य रश्मेर्वायोर्वा स्पर्शसमवायेन रूपसमवायिनो महतश्चोपलम्भः स्यात् अत आह । रूपसंस्कारपदेन रूपसमवायो रूपोद्भवो रूपानभिभवश्च विवक्षितः । तेन यद्यपि वायौ य एव स्पर्शसमवायः स एव रूपसमवायः तथापि रूपनिरूपितो नास्ति रूपात्यन्ताभाववत्त्वात् चाक्षुषे च रश्मौ रूपसंस्कारः रूपोद्भवो नास्ति मध्यन्दिनोल्काप्रकाशे च रूपसंस्कारो रूपानभिभवो नास्ति इति न तेषां प्रत्यक्षता एवं ग्रीष्मोष्मभर्जनकपालानलकनकादिषु रूपसंस्कार उन्नेयः ॥

[2] रूपसंस्कारः संस्कृतं रूपं उद्भूतमिति न्यायात् उद्भूतानभिभूतरूपमिति यावत् तादृशरूपत्वावच्छिन्नाधिकरणत्वाभावाच्च वायोः उपलब्धिः प्रत्यक्षमित्यर्थः न च सम्बन्धसत्तायाः सम्बन्धिसत्तानियामकत्वात् कथं न वायोः रूपाधिकरणत्वमिति वाच्यं वायौ रूपं नास्तीति प्रत्यक्षसिद्धेन रूपाभावेन विरोधित्वात् वायू रूपवानिति प्रत्ययासत्त्वेन तदधिकरणतायाः साधकाभावाच्च यत्र तु न बाधकं किन्तु साधकान्तरं तत्रैव सम्बन्धसत्ता सम्बन्धिसत्तानियामिका इत्यभ्युपगमस्यावश्यकत्वात् द्रव्यत्वस्य सत्त्वकथनन्तु रूपसम्बन्धसत्त्वज्ञापनार्थम् महत्परिमाणसत्त्वाभिधानानुप्रत्यक्षकारणसम्पत्त्यर्थम् उद्भूतत्वविशेषणं भर्जनकपालादिस्पर्शाद्ग्रीष्मोष्मचक्षुराद्युपलब्धिवारणार्थम् अनभिभूतत्वविशेषणम् मध्यन्दिनोल्काप्रकाशादि प्रत्यक्षवारणार्थमिति सङ्क्षेपः ॥

rule that a past passive participle may be employed adjectively) *amounts to appreciable or to unobscured colour* This not existing or in other words there being non existence of the nature of a substratum having such colour for its essential property there is no perception or *sensuous presentation of air* Nor can it be objected Why is there not in air the nature of a substratum of colour inasmuch as the existence of a connection determines the existence of the connected object? For this is contradictory to the non existence of colour given in the presentative cognition that in air there is no colour, and there is nothing to prove that air is a substratum of colour there being no cognition that air possesses colour It must be understood that existence of a connection determines the existence of the connected object in such cases only where there is no impossibility and where there is another proof In fine to affirm the existence of substantiality is to imply the existence of connection with colour To affirm the existence of great existence is to imply the existence of a cause of perception[*] To predicate appreciability is to deny perception of fire within culinary utensils &c and of the hot weather heat &c. To predicate inappreciability is to deny perception of the light of a torch at midday and the like V

Conditions of perception of colour अनेकद्रव्यसमवायात रूपविशेषाच्च रूपोपलब्धि ॥८॥

Aph 8 Perception of colour is consequent on co inhesion of substances more than one and on particularity of colour

[1] Particularity of colour is particularity residing in colour This is appreciability and non obscuration On it perception is consequent. The words co inhesion of substances, more than one are added to meet the possible objection that the colour of an

[1] रूपगतो विशेषो रूपविशेषः तच्चोद्भूतत्वमनभिभूतत्वं रूपत्वञ्च तस्माद्रूपस्योपलब्धिः । नन्वेवं परमाणोर्द्व्यणुकस्य च रूपं गृह्येतेत्यत उक्तमनेकद्रव्यसमवायादिति अनेकपदं भूयस्त्वपरं तेनानेकानि भूयांसि द्रव्याणि आश्रयतया यस्य तदनेकद्रव्यं त्रसरेणुप्रभृति तत्समवायात घटादयो ऽप्यवयवद्वारेण परम्परया ऽनेकद्रव्याश्रया एव रसस्पर्शादेः रूपत्वविरहात उक्तञ्च रूपादिविशेषगुणगतो जातिविशेष एव रूपत्वादिव्याप्य ॥

atom and of a binary atomic aggregate would be likewise perceived The term more than one indicates plurality | Perception therefore, is consequent on the co inhesion of a plurality of substances from a tertiary atomic aggregate and upwards, of which, as their substratum are substances more than one or a plurality of substances Water pots and the like, originating in two constituent parts, as viewed in regressive order comprehend of a plurality of substances | Visual perceptibility has no relation to taste, touch &c inasmuch as there does not exist therein the essence of colours It has no relation to the light of the eye, in consequence of the absence of appreciability Appreciability is a kind of universal entity residing in a particular quality of colour &c and included in the essence of colour U

Minima sensibilia. तेन रसगन्धस्पर्शेषु ज्ञानं व्याख्यातम् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 By this is explained cognition in the case of taste smell and touch

[1] Of the senses other than touch co inhesion in the same substratum with colour is the positive condition of perceptibility to the external organs For this reason the conditions of perception of colour thus stated are here extended to other cases By this means by knowledge afforded by perception of colour As perception of colour is consequent on a particular kind of colour, that is on non-obscuration and appreciability in the essence of colour, so perception of taste is contingent upon a particular kind of savour, that is, upon the distinctive qualities of non obscuration and appre-

[1] स्पर्शातिरिक्तानां रूपसामानाधिकरण्यमेव बहिरिन्द्रियग्राह्यता प्रयोजकमिति रूपप्रत्यक्षसामग्रीमभिधाय तामन्यत्रातिदिशति । तेनेति रूपप्रत्यक्षज्ञानेनेत्यर्थः यथा रूपविशेषात् रूपत्वानभिभूतत्वोद्भूतत्वाद्रूपोपलब्धिस्तथा रसविशेषात् रसत्वानभिभूतत्वोद्भूतत्वलक्षणात् रसोपलब्धिः एवमितरत्रापि बोध्यम् अनेकद्रव्यसमवायश्चातिदेश्य घ्राणरसनत्वगिन्द्रियाणामनुद्भूतगन्धरसस्पर्शानामग्रहणम् पार्थिवादावनुद्भूतगन्धरसयोः सदभ्युपगमे तयोरुपलम्भात् तयोः पार्थिवादावनुपलम्भ एव न तु सत्त्वं इत्येके । विभक्तावयवाद्व्यणुकरूपानुद्भूतावयवग्रहणाम् एव रसस्यापि उष्णजले तत्र रूपस्यानुद्भूतात् स्पर्शस्य चाभिभवान् चितककर्पूरचम्पकादौ रूपरसस्पर्शानामनुद्भूतादनुपलम्भः ॥

ciability in the essence of taste This remark is to be applied in the other cases (viz those of smell and touch) and co-inhesion of a plurality of substances is to be extended to them From inappreciability to the organs of smell taste and touch results non apprehension of smells tastes and touches It is from their inappreciability in a stone and the like that smell and taste are not there perceived, *for they are perceived in the ashes of the stone &c* Some maintain that they are perceived indeed in the stone &c but not distinctly From inappreciability of colour in a substance included in its disjunct elements results its non presentation This is the case likewise with taste In hot water in consequence of *appreciability of light or fire and of its obscuration by touch* is non perception of light or fire In comminuted camphor champaka perfume &c in consequence of their inappreciability is non perception of colour taste and touch U

तस्याभावादव्यभिचार ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 Because of the non existence of this there is no deviation

[1] Gravity also is inherent in a plurality of substances and has a common substratum with colour and magnitude. Why is it not perceptible? This objection is obviated Because of the non existence in gravity of the universal appreciability which is the nature of colour gravity is not perceptible

It might be said that granted that the essence of colour &c does not exist yet there may be perception Accordingly the

[1] ननु गुरुत्वादौ कथ न प्रत्यक्ष महत्त्वस्य उद्भूतरूपस्य च सामानाधिकरण्यस म्बन्धेन तत्र सत्त्वादित्यत श्राह। अत्र तत्पदेन अपकान्तस्यापि कारणकलापस्य परामर्श कार्य्योत्पत्तियोजकतया तस्य प्रसिद्धत्वात तथा च तस्य कारणकलापस्य अभावात अ सत्त्वात अव्यभिचार उद्भूतरूपाभाव कार्य्यकारणभावकल्पनाया गुरुत्व दौ नान्वयव्य भिचार इत्यर्थ तथा च लौकिकविषयतासम्बन्धेन प्रत्यक्षसामान्य प्रत्यक्षातीन्द्रियाणा गुरुत्वादीना गुरुत्वत्वादीना प्रतिबन्धतास्वीकारस्यावश्यकत्वेन तदन्योन्याभावस्य गुरु त्वादावसत्त्वेन सामग्र्यभावाच गुरुत्वादे प्रत्यक्षमिति भाव वल्लभाचार्य्यस्तु एतत्सूत्र मन्यथैव व्याख्यात स्वीकृतञ्च गुरुत्वादे स्पार्शनप्रत्यक्षमिति सद्वप ॥

words no deviation are added, for it is a law that there is no deviation (or unduly wide or narrow assertion) of the five universal entities, the essences of colour &c, in relation to apprehensibility by the respective organs of sense For there only where there is one of the five classes, colour &c, is there apprehensibility by the respective exterior organs, according to the logical form, that whereby absence of the one infers absence of the other Gravity, by reason of the obscurity of the subject of the aphorism, by Praśastadeva classed among things transcendental is by Vallabhácharya said to be perceived by touch U

It might be asked why there is no perception of gravity &c., since magnitude and appreciable colour exist there in a relation of juxta position in a common substratum Accordingly the answer is given In this place by the word this there is reflection upon a number of causes not stated in the text, but which are well known as positive conditions of realisations of the effect. From the non existence of this complement of causes results non deviation (i e, neither excess nor defect of predication), that is on the hypothesis of the causal relation of appreciable colour &c there is deviation of affirmation in relation to gravity &c By reason therefore of the relation of common objectivity to perception in general, and the necessity of admitting that the nature of gravity &c is preventive of the presentation of gravity and the like, which are transcendental and by reason of the non-existence in gravity of the mutually exclusive non existence of these, there being no instrument there is no perception of gravity &c By Vallabháchárya this aphorism is otherwise explained and maintained, viz, that of gravity &c there is tactual perception V

Common sensibles

सङ्ख्याः परिमाणानि पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभागौ परत्वा-
परत्वे कर्म च रूपिद्रव्यसमवायात् चाक्षुषाणि ॥११॥

Aph 11 Numbers, extensions, separateness, conjunction and disjunction, priority and posteriority, and action, as inhering in coloured substance, are visible

[1] Things perceptible by one organ of sense having being discussed *those perceptible by two are enumerated* The absence of compounds is to indicate the mutual independence of these as visible and tangible Though magnitude is supposed it is not by the nature of extension The word and involves the addition of viscidity fluidity, and velocity The term visible implies tangibility, or the particle and may be applicable here after visible The word numbers in the plural comprehends all numbers from unity upwards. If it be held that unity is a universal entity, and *not a quality, then if it exist in substance only, it is existence as* of neither less nor greater extent than the nature of substance, *if,* on the other hand it exist in qualities and actions also it is existence as of neither less nor greater extent than real existence If it be asked how then in the former case there is the nature of unity &c in quality &c it may be answered that it is by unity imputed, or that by reason of the notion of co inherence in one substance, the nature of unity is justly affirmed This unity is eternal in eternal substances in non eternal substances it has for its non coinherent or external cause causal unity Duality &c is resultant *from relative cognition* Relative *cognition is the mental basis of various* unities when *two homogeneous or heterogenous* substances are in contact with the organ of vision U

[2] Things perceptible by two organs of sense are enumeratbd

---

[1] एवमेकैकेन्द्रियग्राह्यानभिधाय द्वीन्द्रियग्राह्यानाह । एतेषां चाक्षुषत्वे स्पार्शनत्वे वा परस्परानपेक्षत्वसूचनाया न्समास यद्यपि महत्त्वापेक्षा अस्ति तथापि न परिमाणत्वेन चकार स्नेहद्रवत्ववेगानामुपसंग्रहार्थं चाक्षुषाणीति स्पार्शनत्वमप्युपलक्षयति यद्वा चकार अत्र चाक्षुषाणि चेत्यत्रापि योज्य सङ्ख्या इति बहुवचनम एकत्वादिका सर्व्वा एव सङ्ख्या संगृह्णाति एकत्व सामान्यमेव न तु गुण इति चेत् तद यदि द्रव्यमात्रवृत्ति तदद्रव्यत्वेन सहान्यूनानतिरिक्तवृत्तिरिक्तवृत्तित्वम अथ गुणकर्म्मणोरपि वर्त्तते तदा सत्तया सहान्यूनानतिरिक्तवृत्तित्वम कथ तर्हि गुणादावप्येकत्वादि प्रत्यय इति चेत आरोपितत्वेन एकार्थसमवायप्रत्यासत्त्या सम्यगेवैकत्वप्रत्ययो वा तदेतदेकत्व नित्यद्रव्येषु नित्यम अनित्येषु कारणैकत्वासमवायिकारणम ॥

[2] द्वीन्द्रियग्राह्यानाह । चाक्षुषाणीत्यत्रापि पूर्वचकारो योजनीय· तेन सङ्ख्यादीनि कर्म्मपर्य्यन्तानि रूपवद्द्रव्यसमवेतानि चाक्षुषाणि स्पार्शनानि चेत्यर्थ कर्म्म चेति चकारात उद्भूतरूपवद्द्रव्याणा योग्यताना स्नेहवेगद्रवत्वाना जातीनाञ्च संग्रह ॥

After the word visible the preceding particle and is to be construed The meaning is then that these entities beginning with sound and ending with action inherent in coloured substance are visible and tangible The particle and after the word action includes by implication viscidity velocity fluidity and their universal essences. *The word coloured indicates appreciability* and consequently there is no incongruity in the fact that these entities, when existent in atoms &c are not perceptible V

अरूपिष्वचाक्षुषाणि ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12[1] In uncoloured substances they are imperceptible to sight

[1] The invisibility of these when existing in inappropriate i e uncoloured substances though involved in the preceding aphorism is stated for the sake of perspicuity The meaning is that these are invisible and intangible in uncoloured or inappropriate subjects It is not said that they are imperceptible because of the arising of an internal perception of the unity of soul V

एतेन गुणत्वे भावे च सर्वेन्द्रियं व्याख्यातम् ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 By this it is explained that knowledge in regard to quality and existence is of all the senses.

[2] Existence means being of all the senses produced by all the senses knowledge perception The sense is therefore that these inasmuch as they are appropriate to are cognised by all the senses V

---

[1] रूपिपद योग्यपर तेन परमाण्वादिगतानामेतेषामप्रत्यक्षत्वे ऽपि नासङ्गति अयोग्यसमवेतानामेतेषामचाक्षुषत्वमर्थापातमपि स्पष्टार्थमाह । अरूपिषु अयोग्येषु एतानि अचाक्षुषाणि अस्पार्शनानि चेत्यर्थ आत्मैकत्वस्य मानसप्रत्यक्षोदयात अप्रत्यक्षाणीति नोक्तम ॥

[2] भाव सत्ता सर्व्वेन्द्रियं सर्व्वेन्द्रियजन्यम ज्ञान प्रत्यक्ष तया च तयो सर्व्वेन्द्रिय योग्यवृत्तित्वात् सर्व्वैरेवेन्द्रियैस्ते गृह्यते इति भाव ॥

SECOND DAILY LESSON

Trichotomy of the non-eternal substances

तत पुन पृथिव्यादिकार्यद्रव्य त्रिविध शरीरेन्द्रिय विषयकसञ्ज्ञम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 The aforesaid product substance earth and the like is threefold under the names of body organ and object

[1] Of these corporeity is a kind of universal attribute an absolute whole possessing action and having for its non coinherent cause conjunction with soul endowed with volition but corporeity is not a universal entity for terrestriality does not admit of the generic and specific. The nature of an organ is adaptability to the common sensory causative of knowledge other than reminiscence or susceptibility of conjunction with the internal organ causative of knowledge accompanied with insusceptibility of the appreciable particular qualities other than sound In regard to the light of the eye of animals that prowl at night another kind of light must be admitted and in regard to visuality the words insusceptibility of appreciable particular qualities other than sound and colour are to be added While the nature of an object is to be the means of phænomenal experience that is to say to be an object of ordinary presentation which is common to substance quality action generality and non existence it is in accordance with the aphorism product substantiality the object of common internal presentation for it is stated in the aphorism that earth and other product substances are three fold Objectivity also then is not a universal entity U

[1] तत्र शरीरत्व प्रयत्नवदात्मसयोगासमवायिकारणवत्क्रियावदन्त्यावयवित्वम उपाधिभेद न तु शरीरत्व जाति पृथिवीत्वादीना परापरभावानुपपत्ते इन्द्रियत्वञ्च स्मृत्यजनकज्ञानकारणमन संयोगाश्रयत्वम शब्देतरोद्भूतविशेषविशेषगुणानाश्रयत्वे सति ज्ञानकारणमन सयोगाश्रयत्व वा नक्तञ्चरनयनरश्मिस्तु तेजान्तरमेव चक्षुष्ट्वे तु शब्दरूपेतरोद्भूतविशेषगुणानाश्रयत्वे सतीति देयम न त्विन्द्रियत्व जाति पृथिवीत्वादिना परापरभावानुपपत्त विषयत्वञ्च यद्यपि प्रतीयमानभोगसाधनत्वम तच्च लौकिकसाक्षात्कारविषयत्वमेव द्रव्यगुणकर्मसामान्याभावसाधारणम तथापि सूत्रानुरोधात् लौकिकसाक्षात्कारविषयकार्यद्रव्यत्व द्रष्टव्यम पृथिव्यादिकार्यद्रव्यम त्रिविधमिति सूत्रम तथा च विषयत्वमपि न जाति ॥

[1] Of these corporeity is a universal existing in that which possesses muscular action existing only in an absolute whole. In this definition the second existing is intended to exclude existence as in a hand, terrestriality, substantiality, existence &c. The term existing in that which possesses muscular motion, is intended to exclude conjunction of water-pots, bodies, &c. The universal, therefore, in the definition is applicable to human and other bodies by consideration of humanity, the nature of Chaitra, and other universals. There exists in trees &c organic motion through connection with divine air, otherwise fractures and wounds in them would not close up. From the multiplicity of the man-lion's (Vishnu's) body, according to the division of æons, the definition may be applied to it by consideration of the universal nature of the man lion. But corporeity is not to be defined only as universal, for thus there would be confusion with terrestriality &c., nor as the substratum of muscular motion, for the definition would be too narrow in relation to body deprived of organic movement. The nature of an organ also is not to be defined only as universal, for there would thus re-

---

[1] अत्र शरीरत्वम् अन्त्यावयविमात्रचेष्टावद्वृत्तिजातिमत्त्वम् हस्तत्वपृथिवीत्वद्रव्यत्वसत्त्वादिवारणाय प्रथमवृत्त्यन्तम् घटत्वादिवारणाय चेष्टावद्वृत्तीति घटशरीरसंयोगादिवारणाय जातीति मनुष्यत्वचैत्रत्वादिजातिमादाय मानुषादिशरीरे लक्षणसमन्वयः वृक्षादावपि चेष्टा अस्त्येव आध्यात्मिकवायुसम्बन्धात् अन्यथा भग्नक्षतसंरोहणादिकं न स्यात् कल्पभेदेन नृसिंहशरीरस्य नानात्वात् नृसिंहत्वजातिमादाय तत्र लक्षणसमन्वयः न तु शरीरत्वं जातिः पृथिवीत्वादिना सङ्करात् नापि चेष्टाश्रयत्वम् निश्चेष्टशरीरे अव्याप्तेः । इन्द्रियत्वमपि न जातिः पृथिवीत्वादिना सङ्करप्रसङ्गात् किन्तु शब्देतरोद्भूतविशेषगुणानाश्रयत्वे सति ज्ञानकारणमनःसंयोगाश्रयत्वम् इन्द्रियमनःसंयोगचर्म्ममनःसंयोगात्ममनःसंयोगा ज्ञानकारणानीति चर्म्मण्यात्मनि चातिव्याप्तिवारणाय सत्यन्तम् श्रोत्रे अव्याप्तिवारणाय शब्देतरेति व्याघ्रादिनयनरश्मेश्चक्षुष्ट्वस्वीकारे तु रूपेतरेत्यपि वक्तव्यम् घ्राणादौ गन्धादिसत्त्वादुद्भूतेति शुक्लत्वादिव्याप्यम् अनुद्भूतत्व जातिर्नास्त्येव तदभावकूटत्वमुद्भूतत्व तच्च संयोगे अस्त्यतोऽसम्भववारणाय विशेषेति कालदिगादावतिव्याप्तिवारणाय ज्ञानकारणेति चक्षुरवयवविषयसंयोगस्यापि चक्षुर्विषयसंयोगद्वारा ज्ञानजनकत्वस्वीकारात् चक्षुरवयवादौ चक्षुःसंयुक्तकालविशेषणतया कालादौ रूपाभावचाक्षुषस्य जनकतया तद्घटकसंयोगस्यापि स्वाश्रयविशेषणतासम्बन्धेन चाक्षुषकारणत्वात् तमादाय कालादौ अतिव्याप्तिवारणाय मनःपदम् विषयत्वञ्च साक्षात् परम्परया वोपभोगसाधनत्वे सति जन्यद्रव्यत्वम् तस्य शरीरेन्द्रियवृत्तित्वेऽपि शिष्यबुद्धिवैशद्यार्थं तयोः पृथगुत्कीर्त्तनमिति संक्षेपः ॥

sult a confusion with terrestriality &c., but as the site of conjunction with the common sensory causative of cognitions, and not the site of appreciable particular qualities other than sound The words not the site &c are intended to prevent an unduly wide predication in regard to the cuticle, and the soul, the causes of cognitions being conjunction of the common sensory and the external organs of sense, conjunction of the cuticle and the internal organ, and conjunction of the soul and the internal organ .. .The nature of an object is product substantiality, being the means of experiences in an immediate succession Though it exists in body and organs, it is separately enumerated to give a more distinct conception to the learner V

प्रत्यक्षाप्रत्यक्षाणां संयोगस्याप्रत्यक्षत्वात् पञ्चात्मकं न विद्यते ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 The body is not composed of the five elements, for the conjunction of things perceptible and imperceptible is imperceptible

[1] *The author now proceeds to refute the assertion that the* body is composed of three or four elements Were the body by reason of its odour moisture heat, breath and compressibility, composed of five elements, the body would be imperceptible in the same manner in which conjunction of wind with trees is imperceptible The aphorism employs an example After the word is the word body is to be supplied Moisture, digestive heat and the other qualities exist only in their respective substances water, fire &c Such is the case also with regard to four elements Let it then it may

[1] इदानीं शरीरस्य त्रैभौतिकत्वचातुर्भौतिकत्वप्रवाद निराकर्तुमाह । गन्धक्लेदपाकव्यूहावकाशदानेभ्य पाञ्चभौतिक यदि शरीरं भवेत तदा अप्रत्यक्ष भवेत् यथा प्रत्यक्षाप्रत्यक्षाणां वायुवनस्पतीनां संयोगो ऽप्रत्यक्षस्तथा शरीरमप्रत्यक्ष स्यादिति दृष्टान्तद्वारक सूत्र पञ्चात्मक न विद्यत इति शरीरमिति शेष क्लेदपाकादयस्तु उपष्टम्भकजलानलगता एव चातुर्भौतिकोऽप्येवम नन्वस्तु त्रैभौतिकम त्रयाणा भूताना प्रत्यक्षत्वादिति चेन्न विजातीयारम्भस्य प्रतिषेधात एकस्य गुणस्यान्यधर्मिणि गुणानारम्भकत्वात् तद् यदि पृथिवीजलाभ्यामारम्भ स्यात् तदा तदा रूपमगन्धमरसञ्चस्यात एव पृथिव्यनलाभ्यामगन्धमरूपमरसञ्च स्यात् पृथिव्यनिलाभ्यामगन्धमरसमरूपमस्पर्शञ्च स्यादित्याद्यूह्यम् ॥

be urged, consist of three elements, for three elements are perceptible This is not the case for an integration out of heterogeneous elements is denied One quality in a whole is not originative of other qualities If therefore the commencement were from earth and water, that which they originate would be void of odour and taste In like manner if it originated in earth, and air, it would be destitute of smell, taste, colour and touch Such and other inferences are obvious U

गुणान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च न त्र्यात्मकम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The body is not composed of three elements, because there is not manifested another quality

[1] A body originated by quality, perceptible earth, water, and light might be perceptible if there were manifested in it another quality having for its antecedent a quality of the cause This is not the case, for it has been already stated that a single odour &c. is not originative Therefore the body is not composed of three elements nor originated by three coloured substances U

अणुसंयोगस्त्वप्रतिषिद्धः ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 A conjunction of atoms is not denied

[2] How then do we observe digestive heat &c. in one single body? The answer is given in the text. A mutual conjunction of the five elements as receptive of one another is not denied But

---

[1] पृथिव्यप्तेजसां प्रत्यक्षाणामेवारब्धं शरीरं प्रत्यक्षस्यादपि यदि तत्र गुणान्तरं कारणगुणपूर्व्वकं प्रादुर्भवेत न त्वेतदस्ति एकस्य गन्धादेरनारम्भकत्वस्योक्तत्वात् तथा च न त्र्यात्मकमपि शरीरं न रूपवद्भूतत्रयारब्धमपीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] कथं तर्ह्येकस्मिन्नेव शरीरे पाकादीनामुपलम्भ इत्यत आह । मिथः पञ्चानां भूतानां परस्परमुपष्टम्भकतया संयोगो न निषिध्यते किन्तु विजातीययोरवयवोर्द्वयं प्रत्यसमवायिकारणं संयोगो नेष्यते तथा च तदुपष्टम्भात् पाकादीनां शरीरे भयत्युपलम्भ इति तर्हि किम्प्रकृतिकमिदं मानुषशरीरमित्यत्र गौतमीयं सूत्रमुपतिष्ठते पार्थिवं तद्विशेषगुणोपलब्धेः पृथिवीविशेषगुणो गन्धो मानुषशरीरे आनाशमनपायो दृश्यते पाकादयस्तु शुष्कशरीरे नोपलभ्यन्ते इति तेषामौपाधिकत्वं गन्धस्य स्वाभाविकत्वमिति पार्थिवत्वव्यवस्थितेः ॥

it is not affirmed that two heterogeneous atoms are the non-coinherent cause of a substance It is, therefore, in consequence of the receptivity of those that vital heat &c is observed in the body If it be asked then, of what nature the human body is, we cite the aphorism of Gautama:—That the body is terrestrial, for the particular quality (of earth) is observed. Odour the particular quality of earth is observed in the human body as not departing from it till its dissolution Vital heat &c is not observed in the decayed body These qualities, therefore, are accidental, but its odour is essential according to the constitution of terrestriality U

तत्र शरीरं द्विविधं योनिजमयोनिजञ्च ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5. *Of these, body is twofold uterine and non-uterine*

[1] *Of these*—among terrestrial, aqueous and other bodies—the terrestrial *body is twofold* What are *the two kinds? It is an*swered in the text that they are uterine and non uterine Aqueous, igneous, and aerial bodies, known in the spheres of Varuna, the sun, and air, are exclusively non-uterine The bodies of gods and sages are non-uterine, *according to the text of revelation,* Manu and others the sensorial sons of Brahmá If it be asked how there can be an effect without a cause, we reply that the womb is not a

---

[1] तत्र पार्थिवाप्यादिशरीरेषु मध्ये पार्थिवं शरीरं द्विविधम के ते द्वे विधे इत्यत्राह । योनिजमयोनिजञ्चेति आप्यतैजसवायवीयशरीराणां वरुणादित्यवायुलोकेषु प्रसिद्धानामयोनिजत्वमेव अयोनिजत्वं शुक्रशोणितसन्निपातानपेक्षत्वम अयोनिजञ्च देवानामृषीणाञ्च श्रूयते हि ब्रह्मणो मानसा मन्वादय इति कारणमन्तरेण कथं कार्य्यमिति चेत् योनेः शरीरत्वावच्छेदेनाकारणत्वात उष्मजकृमिमशकादिशरीरे व्यभिचारात संस्थानविशेषवत्त्वस्य चासिद्धेः देवर्षिशरीरापेक्षया ऽस्मदादिशरीराणामन्यादृशत्वात् योनिजम् द्विविधं जरायुजमण्डजञ्च जरायुजमानुषपशुमृगाणां गर्भाशयस्य जरायुजन्वात सर्पकीटमत्स्यादयो ऽपि स्वेदजा सह अण्डजा अपि वृक्षादयो ऽपि शरीराण्येव सह भोगाधिष्ठानत्वात् न खलु भोगाधिष्ठानत्वमन्तरेण जीवनमरणस्वप्नजागरणभेषजप्रयोगबीजसजातीयानुबन्धानुकूलोपगमप्रतिकूलापगमादयः सम्भवन्ति वृद्धिक्षतभग्नसंरोहेण च भोगोपपादके स्फुटे एव आगमो ऽप्यस्ति नर्म्मदातीरसम्भूताः शरलार्ज्जुनपादपाः नर्म्मदातोयसंस्पर्शात् ते यान्ति परमां गतिम इत्यादिः श्मशाने जायते वृक्ष कङ्कगृध्रादिसेवितः इत्यादिश्च तथापि चेष्टावत्त्वमिन्द्रियवत्त्वञ्च नोद्भिदां स्फुटतरमतो न शरीरव्यवहारः ॥

cause essential to corporeity, for the affirmation that is was so would be erroneous in regard to the bodies of worms mosquitoes &c, generated by warmth No difference of constitution is known for our bodies are not different in appearance from those of the divine sages The uterine is twofold *viviparous and oviparous* *Viviparous* are the bodies of men and animals wild and domestic The bodies of birds and reptiles are oviparous Snakes worms fishes &c are called reptiles because it is their nature to creep about Though trees &c are a kind of bodies being subjects of fruition —*for life death sleep waking, the use of medicine seminal* propagation desire of the agreeable aversion from the disagreeable &c are impossible without a subject of fruition and growth and the closing up of fractures are *manifest means of fruition*, and there is the sacred text The Sarala and Arjuna trees which grow on the banks of the Narmada from contact with the waters of the river attain to the highest state hereafter &c and such as In the burning ground grows a tree haunted by herons and vultures yet germinant bodies do not evidently possess muscular motion and sensitive organs and they are not therefore in common usage called bodies U

Non uterine bodies exist

अनियतदिग्देशपूर्वकत्वात ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Because (the non uterine body) has antecedents of indeterminate time and space,—

[1] It might be asked how the non uterine body of Manu and

[1] ननु मन्वादीनामयोनिजं शरीरं कथमुत्पद्यते शुक्रशोणितारम्भकपरमाणूनामेव विशिष्टशरीरारम्भकत्वेन तत्र तदभावादित्याशङ्कायामाह । अनियतौ दिग्देशौ यथा ते अनियतदिग्देशाः परमाणवस्तत्पूर्वकत्वात तदधीनत्वात् सन्त्ययोनिजा इति दशमसूत्रेण पञ्चमान्तानां चतुर्णां सूत्राणामन्वय तथा च वरुणलोकादौ अयोनिजा आप्या तैजसा वायवीया मानसाश्च देहा सन्ति तेषां शुक्रशोणिताद्यनपेक्षोत्पत्तिकानामारम्भका परमाणव कुत आगच्छन्ति योनिजेषु शुक्रशोणितपरमाणव एवारम्भका दृष्टा इत्याशङ्कानिरासार्थमुक्तमिदम पार्थिवा जलीया तैजसा वायवीयाश्च परमाणव सर्वासु दिक्षु सर्वेषु देशेषु च सन्ति तेषां दिग्देशनियमाभावात् अयोनिजशरीरोत्पत्तौ न परमाणुभिरिदम न हि शुक्रशोणितपरमाणुभिरेव परमाणवो न देहारम्भका दशमशकतच्छु स्त्यादिदेहानुपपत्तिप्रसङ्गादित्यर्थं ॥

others is produced seeing that it is atoms originative of semen and blood that are originative of a particular body, and that these do not there exist. In anticipation of this difficulty the aphorism is stated Atoms indeterminate in time and space are those which are not astricted to particular time and space From having these for their antecedents or conditions, there exist non uterine bodies, such being the connection of the four aphorisms succeeding the fifth with the tenth. There exist, therefore in the sphere of Varuna &c non uterine bodies, aqueous, igneous aerial sensorial To meet the question as to whence come the atoms originative of beings whose production is independent of semen blood &c, it being seen that in the case of uterine bodies it is only seminal and sanguineous atoms that are originative the following statement has been made. Atoms terrene aqueous, igneous and aerial, exist in all quarters and are in all places and there being no local determination of these there is no lack of atoms in the production of non uterine bodies For it is not true that no atoms other than seminal or sanguineous are originative of bodies since were it so, it would follow that there was no production of the bodies of gnats, musquitoes trees shrubs &c V

धर्मविशेषाच्च ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Also because of peculiar merit

[1] The sense is that in creation &c motion arises in the atoms in consequence only of conjunction of soul with the fruits of actions done in a former state of being, and that the atoms having by that action come together originate in the order of binary atomic aggregates &c the non uterine bodies of divine sages and others The following implication is also to be considered that it is in conse

---

[1] अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगादेव सर्गादौ परमाणुषु कर्म तेन च कर्मणा सम्भूय परमाणवो द्व्यणुकक्रमेण अयोनिजं देवर्षीणां शरीरमारभन्ते इत्यर्थः उपलक्षणञ्चैतत् अधर्मविशेषाच्च क्षुद्रजन्तूनामुत्कटानां मशकादीनां यातनामयानि शरीराण्युत्पद्यन्ते इत्यपि द्रष्टव्यं ॥

quence of peculiar demerit that the tortured bodies of musquitoes and other insects generated by heat are produced U

समाख्याभावाच्च ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Also because names exist

[1] Because names or terms are or exist, without an ancestor or father to bestow them, for these words, are to be supplied For not all names are imposed by a father &c, such terms as water pot, cloth, not being thus assigned It is therefore the same God who imposed names on water pots, cloth and other inanimate things, that imposed the names Manu Maríchi &c on non uterine bodies V

संज्ञाया अनादित्वात् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Because the name is without beginning

[2] By means of the primordial name Brahma &c which became manifest in creation &c it is known that non uterine body exists For there are not parents of Brahmá, by whom the name Brahmá should be invented U

सन्त्ययोनिजाः ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 There exist non uterine bodies

[3] Here is pointed out that which is established by the four preceding aphorisms The words peculiar bodies of Manu Marichi, and others are to be supplied V

वेदलिङ्गाच्च ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 (*This follows*) also *from the evidence of the Veda*

---

[1] समाख्या संज्ञा तस्याभावात् सत्त्वात् योनिजपित्रादिक विनेति शेषः न हि सर्व्वा संज्ञा पित्रादिभिर्निवेशिता घटपटादिसंज्ञानान्तथात्वाभावात् तथा च येनेश्वरेण घटपटाद्यचेतनेषु संज्ञा निवेशितास्तेनैव मनुमरीच्यादिसंज्ञा अयोनिजेषु शरीरेषु निवेशिता इति भावः ॥

[2] सर्गादौ या ब्रह्मादिसंज्ञा आदिभूता प्राथमिकीतया क्रियते अस्त्ययोनिज शरीरमिति न हि तदा ब्रह्मणो मातापितरौ स्तः याभ्यां ब्रह्मादिसंज्ञा कृता स्यादिति भावः ॥

[3] इदानीं चतुर्णामुक्तानां सूत्राणां साध्यं निर्दिशति मनुमरीच्यादीनां देहविशेषा इति शेषः ॥

reveals the flavour of grain fried and ground This is cognisant of taste and the classes contained under it Smell and taste have no power to cognise matter The organ of vision is igneous, for whereas it does not manifest odour &c it does manifest colour, in the same manner as the light of a lamp This organ, by contact in the form of conjunction cognises substances of appreciable colour and possessed of magnitude It cognises also by contact in the form of co inherence in the conjunct, colour, number, extension, individuality, conjunction, disjunction, priority, posteriority, velocity, viscidity, fluidity, motion, and generality existing in such substances By contact in the form of co-inherence in the co inherent in the conjunct it cognises universal entities existent in that which exists in the existent (such as the nature of the class cow, such nature existing in the class which exists in its constituent members.) By being qualitative of the conjunct by being qualitative of the coinherent in the conjunct &c it cognises universal non existences (viz antecedent subsequent and absolute non existence) which are non-existent in the existent and also reciprocal non existences (such as the non existence of a water pot as a piece of cloth) which are non existent in the non existent residing in the existent According to the *system of Kaṇáda there is no perception of co-inherence.* The organ of touch pervades the body and is cognisant of appreciable touches and the classes therein contained It thus cognises the objects cognisable to the eye with the exception of colour and the universal entities residing in colour only According to the moderns it also cognises air Its contact (with the tactile object) is as described above. The form of inference respecting it is therefore as follows —This organ is aerial for while it does not manifest colour &c it does manifest touch like the wind from a fan which manifests coldness in the perspiration adhering to the limbs In all the aforesaid inferences the clause beginning with while or whereas is inserted to prevent an undue applicability to soul the internal organ &c So also, to prevent undue applicability to contact, we

must add the qualification there being substantiality The organ of hearing is ether limited to the outer part of the ear. This cognises sounds by co inherence and the universals contained in sounds by co inherence in the co inherent Whatever organ is cognisant of anything is cognisant also of the universal non-existences in it non-existent, *and of the reciprocal non-existences residing* in it. So much for the five external organs The common sensory is an internal organ, and by *conjunction* cognises soul tinged with its peculiar attributes. *By co-inherence in the conjunct it cognises thought, pleasure, pain, desire, aversion, and volition, and a universal viz. the nature of soul. By co-inherence in the co-inherent in the conjunct it cognises the universals existent in thought, &c.* A full discussion of the subject may be sought elsewhere. V

FIFTH BOOK FIRST DAILY LESSON

Action investigated. आत्मसंयोगप्रयत्नाभ्यां हस्ते कर्म ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1. Action in the hand is by means of conjunction with, and volition of, soul.

[1] The object of the fifth chapter is the investigation of action The investigation of action determinable by volition is that of the first daily lesson In this there are sections treating of (1) throwing upwards (2) throwing upwards effected without volition (3) of action which has merit for its cause, (4 of actions good bad and indifferent. The aphorism is propounded in relation to a particular kind of muscular action Action in the hand as its co-inherent cause is by means of conjunction with soul and of volition of soul Of this action the non-coinherent cause is conjunction with soul

[1] कर्मपरीक्षा पञ्चमाध्यायार्थः प्रथमं निमित्तकर्मपरीक्षा प्रथमाह्निकार्थः तत्राप्युत्क्षेपणप्रकरणम् पुण्यहेतुकर्मप्रकरणम् पुण्यापेक्षानिष्कर्मप्रकरणञ्च चेष्टाविशेषमधिकृत्याह। सप्तमवयवस्य संयोगप्रयत्नौ आत्मनः संयोगप्रयत्नौ ताभ्यां हस्ते समवायिकारणे कर्म तस्य च कर्मणः प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगो ऽसमवायिकारणम् प्रयत्नश्च निमित्तकारणम् एवमेव चेष्टा प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणजन्यक्रियाया चेष्टात्वात् स्याप्तमयंतस्यातिरिक्तसर्वतदन्यप्रयत्नजन्यक्रियाया वा ॥

possessing volition Volition is the efficient cause This is muscular action, for muscular action is action whose non coinherent cause is conjunction with soul possessing volition or action produced by volition of a subject other than the tangible which is not coinherent with or excluded from, self U

तथ हस्तसयेागाच्च मुसले कर्म ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 In like manner and from conjunction with the hand is action in the pestle

[1] By the particle and gravity is implied as another efficient cause In like manner from conjunction with the hand may also mean from conjunction with the hand possessed of upward motion In this instance the non coinherent cause is conjunction of the pestle *with the hand conjunct with soul possessing volition The co inherent* cause is the pestle The efficient causes are volition and gravity U

अभिघातजे मुसलादेा कर्मणि व्यतिरेकादकारणा हस्तसयेाग ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 In the action produced in a pestle and the like by impact conjunction with the hand is not a cause being excluded *from it*

[2] The cause of the sudden upward motion which is produced in *the pestle when struck by the mortar is stated In this in*stance though there is conjunction of the hand with the rising

[1] चकारेण गुरुत्व निमित्तकारणान्तर समुच्चिनोति तथेति तादृशमुत्क्षेपणमित्यर्थ यद्वा तथा हस्तसयेागादुत्क्षेपणवद्धस्तसयेागादित्यर्थ अत्र च प्रयत्नवदात्मसयु`न हस्तेन मुसलस्य सयेागा असमवायिकारणम् मुसल समवायिकारणम प्रयत्नगुरुत्वे निमित्त कारण ॥

[2] उदूखलाभिहतस्य मुसलस्याकस्माद् यदुत्पतन जायते तत्र कारणमाह । अत्र यद्यपि मुसलेन उत्पतता हस्तस्य सयेागेाऽप्यस्ति तथाऽपि स सयेागा अन्यथा सिद्ध किन्तु उदूखलाभिघात एव असमवायिकारणम कृत गम्यमित्यत आह । व्यतिरेकादिति प्रयत्नस्य व्यभिचारादित्यर्थ यदि यदा प्रयत्न स्यात् मुसलस्याकस्मिकमुत्पतन न भवेत् विधारकेण प्रयत्नेन मुसलस्य धारणमेव भवेत तदधीन मुसलस्य पुनरुत्पतन वा भवेत इति भाव ॥

pestle, such conjunction is superfluous if regarded as a cause The impact of the mortar is only the non coinherent cause It may be asked why this is the case It is therefore stated that it is so because of the exclusion, that is, because volition would too widely or too narrowly predicated If there were volition in this case, there would be no sudden upward motion in the pestle. By a volition to hold the pestle and mortar apart there would be a mere *sustention of the pestle*, or *the upward motion of the pestle would* depend upon volition U.

तथात्मसंयोगो हस्तकर्म्मणि ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 In like manner conjunction with soul in relation to action in the hand (is not a cause)

[1] *The aphorism is stated with the purpose of specifying* a particular cause of the action of the hand as it flies upwards with the pestle, and of disproving the con coinherent causality of conjunction with soul exercising volition The meaning is that conjunction with soul that is conjunction with soul exercising volition, is likewise not a cause of action in the hand as it suddenly rises with the pestle The term not a cause is in the preceding aphorism The words in like manner are used to imply analogy U

अभिघातान्मुसलसंयोगाद्धस्ते कर्म्म ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 The action in the hand is from impact and from conjunction with pestle

[2] An answer is *furnished to the question* Whence then at

---

[1] मुसलेन सहोत्पतता हस्तस्य कर्म्मणि कारणे विशेषमभिधातुं प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगस्यासमवायिकारणत्वं निराकर्त्तुमाह । मुसलेन सहोत्पतता हस्तस्य कर्म्मणि आत्मसंयोगः प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगस्तथा अकारणमित्यर्थः अकारणमिति पूर्व्वसूत्रस्य तथेत्यतिदिश्यते ॥

[2] कुतस्तर्हि हस्ते तदोत्पतनमत आह । यथा मुसले उत्पतति मुसलमुपस्य लोह मुत्पतति तथा हस्तो ऽपि तदोत्पतति अत्राभिघातशब्देन अभिघातजनित संस्कार उच्यते उपचारात उत्पतता मुसलस्य पटुतरेण कर्म्मणा अभिघातसहकृतेन स्वाश्रये मुसले संस्कारो जनितस्तत्कृत संस्कारमपेक्ष्य हस्तमुसलसंयोगादसमवायिकारणाद्धस्ते ऽप्युत्पतन न तु तदुत्पतन प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणम् अवशो हि हस्तो मुसलेन सहोत्पततीति भावः ॥

that time the upward motion of the hand? The hand rises at that time in the same manner in which the metal at the end of the pestle rises By the word impact, is elliptically expressed recoil produced by impact. A recoil is produced in the pestle as its substratum by the vigorous action in the pestle accompanied with the impact. The upward motion in the hand also is consequent upon conjunction of the hand and pestle in relation to the recoil so effected, as its non-coinherent cause. But this upward motion has not for its non-coinherent cause conjunction with soul exercising volition, for the hand rises involuntarily together with the pestle U

आत्मकर्म हस्तसंयोगाच्च ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 *Action of the soul is also from conjunction with the hand*

[1] *An answer is furnished to the objection* In the case of the action which is produced in the body or in a part of the body, conjunction with soul exercising volition is the cause why is it not so in the present instance? The term soul tropically signifies a portion of the body The impossibility of literal construction is the germ of tropical interpretation The action then of the soul that is of a member of the body, that is of the hand results from conjunction of the hand and pestle The word and implies also velocity In the action of the hand conjunction with the hand is the non-coinherent cause There is here no unduly wide or narrow predication This conjunction is at some times conjunction with *the soul willing at others conjunction with the pestle possessed of velocity*, as is the case with the limbs of one who has the gout. U

[1] ननु शरीरे शरीरावयवे वा यत्कर्मोपलब्धं तत्र प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगः कारणम् प्रकृते कथं न तथेत्यत आह। आत्मशब्दः शरीरावयवपरः उपचारात् अन्यथानुपपत्तिश्चोपचारबीजम् तथा चात्मनः शरीरावयवस्यापि हस्तस्य यत्कर्म्म तत् हस्तमुसलसंयोगात् चकाराद्वेगसमुच्चय हस्तकर्म्मणि हस्तसंयोगस्तावदसमवायिकारणं तत्र व्यभिचारो नास्ति स च क्वचित् प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगः क्वचिद्वेगवन्मुसलादिहस्तसंयोगः यथा वातुलस्य शरीरावयवकर्म्मेति भावः ॥

संयोगाभावे गुरुत्वात् पतनम् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 In the absence of conjunction falling results from gravity

[1] By the term conjunction impediments of whatever kind are also implied In the absence therefore of impediments in consequence of gravity as its non coinherent cause falling an action resulting in conjunction below, is produced Here in fruit &c possessing gravity the impediment is conjunction, in a bird &c. sustentative volition is the impediment to falling; in an arrow discharged it is the recoil that is the impediment to falling The sense is that falling is dependent on gravity in the absence of these obstructives U

[2] In the case of a body resting upon a tree or other high place falling in consequence of the breaking of the bough &c which supports it or by accidentally slipping it is gravity which is the cause not conjunction with soul exercising volition for that does not occasion falling but sometimes prevents it Hence it is that in the case of birds &c soaring in the sky in consequence of conjunction with soul possessing volition as an impediment there is no fall In like manner it is from conjunction with God possessing volition as an impediment that the earth and other worlds do not fall V

नोदनविशेषाभावान्नोर्ध्वं न तिर्यग्गमनम् ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 No upward or sideward motion takes place without a particular impulse

---

[1] संयोगपदेन प्रतिबन्धकमात्रमुपलक्षयति प्रतिबन्धकाभावे गुरुत्वादसमवायिकारणात् पतनम् अध संयोगफलिका क्रिया जायते तत्र गुरुत्ववति फलादौ प्रतिबन्धकः संयोगः विहङ्गमादौ तु विधारकः प्रयत्नः पतनप्रतिबन्धकः काण्डादौ क्षिप्ते संस्कार एव पतनप्रतिबन्धकः एतेषामभावे गुरुत्वाधीनं पतनमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] वृक्षाद्युच्चदेशारूढस्य देहस्य अवलम्बनशाखादिभङ्गेन दैवात् स्खलनादिना यत् पतनं भवति तत्र गुरुत्वमेव कारणं न तु प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगः तस्य पतनाप्रयोजकत्वात् क्वचित् प्रतिबन्धकत्वाच्च अत एव विहायसि विहरतां विहङ्गमानां प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगादेव प्रतिबन्धान्न पतनम् एवं प्रयत्नवदीश्वरसंयोगात् प्रतिबन्धादेव भूरादिलोकानां न पतनम् ॥

¹ The perpendicular or horizontal motion which takes place in a clod of earth, an arrow &c, though they possess gravity, results from a particular, that is a violent, impulse In the case of the falling, therefore, of a fruit a bird, an arrow &c, in the absence of conjunction, volition, and recoil, there does not exist a particular impulse, and consequently there is no vertical or lateral motion U

प्रयत्नविशेषाचोदनविशेषः ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Particular impulse results from particular volition.

नोदनविशेषादुदसनविशेषः ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 From particular impulse results particular casting upward

² As for particular impulse, whence is it produced? This question is answered Particular impulse is produced by particular volition, *of which the cause is the desire to throw sidewards* or upwards far or near By this impulse &c., perpendicular or horizontal movement is produced in a substance such as a clod of earth Casting upwards is throwing far upwards U

हस्तकर्म्मणा दारककर्म्म व्याख्यातम् ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 By the action of the hand, the action of a child is explained

³ The action which is produced in the hand *together with the* pestle by the impact of the mortar, is not preceded by volition

---

¹ गुरुत्ववतो ऽपि लोष्ठकाण्डादेर्यदूर्ध्वं तिर्य्यक् च गमनं तन्नोदनविशेषात् तीव्रतराचोदनात् तथा च फलपक्षिवाणादौ संयोगप्रयत्नसंस्काराभावे यत्र पतनं तत्र नोदनविशेषो नास्ति तेन न तिर्य्यग् न वोर्द्ध्वं गमनमिति भावः ॥

² ननु नोदनविशेष एव कुत उत्पद्यते तत्राह। तिर्य्यक् उर्द्ध्वं दूरम् आसन्नं वा क्षिपामीतीच्छाकारणकः प्रयत्नविशेषः तज्जनितो नोदनविशेषस्ततो गुरुत्ववतो द्रव्यस्य लोष्ठादेरूर्द्ध्वं तिर्य्यक् च गमनमुपपद्यते उदसनं दूरोत्क्षेपणम् ॥

³ उदूखलाभिघातात् मुसलेन सह हस्ते यत्कर्म्म उत्पन्नं तत्तावत् प्रयत्नपूर्व्वकं न भवति नापि पुण्यपापहेतुरेतत्तुल्यता बालकस्य क्रीडाकरचरणादिचालनं यत्तत्रातिदिशति बालकस्य यद्यपि करचरणादिचालनं प्रयत्नपूर्व्वकमेव तथापि हिताहितफलप्राप्तिफलकं न भवति न वा पुण्यपापहेतुरित्यतिदेशार्थः ॥

or a cause of merit and demerit The analogy of this motion to a *child's movement in the play of its hands and feet is pointed out* Though a child's movement of its hands and feet has volition for *its antecedent* it has *no good or evil result* and *is not a cause of* merit or demerit. Such is the meaning of the analogy U

तथा दग्धस्य विस्फोटने ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 In like manner in the case of the bursting open of one burnt

[1] In a house which has been set on fire by a felon when a man has there been burnt and his body torn open by the fire the action which is produced in the hand &c by the will to kill the felon is neither a cause of merit nor a cause of demerit, as it has been said In the slaying of a felon there is no sin in him that slays openly or covertly wrath encounters wrath An incendiary a poisoner an assasin a thief a ravisher of wife or field—these six are felons U

Involuntary motion

प्रयत्नाभावे प्रसुप्तस्य चलनम् ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Movement of the sleeping takes place in the absence of volition

[2] Movement action such as the sideward or upward moving of the limbs takes place in the sleeping in the body possessing a state of profound slumber even in the absence of volition generated by such desire as to throw upwards A particular volition is not therefore always the cause of such motion V

---

[1] आततायिना केनाप्यगारे दह्यमाने तत्र दग्धस्य पुरुषस्य विस्फोटे विहिते सति तस्याततायिनो वधानुकूलेन प्रयत्नेन हस्तादौ यत्कर्म्म जनितं तन्न पुण्यहेतुर्न वा पापहेतु यथाहु नाततायिवधे दोषो हन्तुर्भवति कश्चन प्रकाशं वा अप्रकाशं वा मन्युस्तन्मन्युमृच्छति । अग्निदोगरदश्चैव शस्त्रपाणिर्धनापहः । क्षेत्रदारापहारी च षडेते आततायिन ॥

[2] ऊर्ध्वं क्षिपामीत्यादीच्छाजनितप्रयत्नाभावे ऽपि प्रसुप्तस्य सुषुप्त्यवस्थान्वितस्य शरीरस्य चलनं तिर्यगूर्ध्वाङ्गचालनादिकर्म्म उत्पद्यते इत्यर्थ तथा च प्रयत्नविशेषो न सर्वत्र हेतुरिति भाव ॥

तृणे कर्म वायुसंयोगात् ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 Action tlkes place in grass from conjunction with wind

[1] The actions of the body being explained those of other ob ects are treated of All such objects as trees, shrubs, climbing plants, are implied in the term grass U

मणिगमनं सूच्यभिसर्पणमदृष्टकारणम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 The movement of the gem, and the approach of the needle are caused by destiny

[2] By the term gem are intended vessels made of gold &c. and filled with water To such a vessel magicians apply incantations for the recovery of stolen property The tradition of the ancients is that the vessel is set on the ground, and some other person lays his hand upon it The vessel accompanied with the hand in consequence of the efficacy of the incantation turns towards the spot where the stolen property has been deposited The reason of the movement of such a vessel is not a particular volition, but the efficient cause is the merit of the former possessor or the demerit of the thief The non coinherent cause is conjunction of such a vessel with soul possessing such destiny (or results of actions done in previous states of existence) , and the co inherent cause is

---

[1] शरीरकर्म्माणि व्याख्याय तदितराण्याह । तृणपदेन वृक्षगुल्मलताप्रतानादिकं सर्व्वमुपलक्षयति ॥

[2] मणिपदेन जलपूर्णकाञ्चनादिमयपात्राण्यभिप्रेतानि चौर्य्यधनलब्धये तु तादृशपात्रे मान्त्रिकैर्मन्त्रप्रयोगः क्रियते तादृशपात्रन्तु भूमौ तिष्ठति तदुपरि अपरेण केनचिद्धस्तः स्थाप्यते मन्त्रसामर्थ्यात्तत्पात्रं तादृशहस्तसहितमेव चौर्य्यधनाधारस्थानाभिमुखं गच्छति तत्र स्थाने गत्वा स्थिरं भवतीति प्राचां किंवदन्ती तादृशपात्रगमनेन प्रयत्नविशेषो हेतुः किन्तु पूर्व्वस्वामिनः सुकृतं चौरस्य दुष्कृतं वा निमित्तकारणम् तादृशपात्रन्तु समवायिकारणम् एवं अयस्कान्तसन्निधाने सति सूचीनां लौहशलाकानां यदयस्कान्ताभिमुखगमनं भवति तत्रापि अदृष्टमेव हेतुः ननु कस्यादृष्टेन सूच्यादीनां गमनमिति चेत् तद्गमनेन यस्य हितमहितं वा भवति तददृष्टस्यैव तत्र हेतुत्वम् सूचीत्युपलक्षणम् अयस्कान्ताकृष्टलौहमात्रमभिप्रेतम् तृणकान्तमण्याकृष्टानां तृणानां गमने वह्नेरूर्ध्वज्वलने वायोस्तिर्य्यग्गमने सर्गाद्यकालीनपरमाणुकर्म्मणि चादृष्टकारणकत्वमूहनीयमिति संक्षेपः ॥

such a vessel In like manner destiny is also the cause of the attraction towards a loadstone, which takes place in needles or metallic rods when in proximity to the magnet If it be asked in consequence of whose destiny (or previous merits and demerits) motion takes place in needles &c, the reply is that it is the destiny *of him to whom benefit or injury accrues by the motion, that is* the cause The term needle implies other objects iron in general, attracted by the loadstone being intended It is to be inferred that destiny is the cause of the motion of pieces of grass attracted by amber, of the upward flaming of fire, of the horizontal motion of wind, and of the action of the primordial atoms at creation V.

इषावयुगपत्संयोगविशेषाः कर्मान्यत्वे हेतु॰ ॥ १६ ॥

Aph. 16. *Particular non simultaneous conjunctions in an arrow are the cause of the diversity of its action*

[1] The sense of this aphorism is as follows After conjunction of arrows &c moving with velocity, with a wall and the like, a cessation of motion is observed, though the arrows &c continue to exist *In this case it is not destruction of the substratum that is* destructive of motion, for the substratum continues to exist Also no other contrary property is observed. It therefore, follows that it is a self produced conjunction that destroys the action of the arrow This conjunction produced in the fourth moment destroys the action in the fifth moment The meaning therefore is that the production of the action then disjunction, next the destruction of the prior conjunction, the subsequent conjunction and the *destruction of the action, make known the diversity of the action*

[1] इदमत्राकूतं वेगेन गच्छता शरादीनां कुड्यादिसंयोगानन्तरं शरादौ सत्येव गत्युपरमो दृश्यते अत्राश्रयनाशस्तावन्न नाशकः आश्रयस्य विद्यमानत्वात् विरोधिगुणान्तरञ्च नोपलभ्यते तेन स्वजन्यः संयोग एव कर्मनाशक इत्युन्नीयते स च संयोगश्चतुर्थक्षणे जातः पञ्चमक्षणे कर्म नाशयति तथाहि कर्मोत्पत्तिरथ विभाग अथ पूर्वसंयोगनाशः उत्तरसंयोगः कर्मनाशः तेनायुगपत् संयोगविशेषाः कर्मनानात्वज्ञापका इत्यर्थः संयोगविशेषा इति संयोगविशेषः स्वजन्यत्वमेव अन्यथा संयोगमात्रस्य कर्मनाशकत्वे कर्म क्वचिदपि न तिष्ठेत ॥

Particular conjunctions, means peculiarity in conjunction, of self production Otherwise, were conjunction in general destructive of action, action could not abide anywhere U

नोदनादाद्यमिषोः कर्म तत्कर्मकारिताच्च सस्कारादुत्तर तथो
त्तरमुत्तरञ्च ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 The first action of the arrow is from impulse, the next is from self-reproduction caused by that action and in like manner the next and the next

[1] The first action in an arrow when discharged is produced by a bowstring drawn by human volition In this case the impulse is the non coinherent cause, the arrow is the co-inherent cause volition and gravity are the efficient causes By this first action self reproduction termed velocity is produced in the same substance This is established by the perception that it is the arrow moves with velocity By this self reproduction action is produced in the arrow Of this the non coinherent cause is the self reproduction, the co inherent cause is the arrow, and the efficient cause is a particular keen impetus In like manner a succession of actions one after the other is produced by the self reproduction which continues until the arrow falls A single self reproduction produces a succession of actions for when an action is destroyed by subsequent conjunction produced by itself the self reproduction produces another action It is not proper to suppose a succession

---

[1] पुरुषप्रयत्ने नाकृष्टया पतञ्चिक्रया नुन्नस्येषोराद्यं कर्म जायते तत्र नोदनमसमवायिकारणम् इषु समवायिकारणम प्रयत्नगुरुत्वे निमित्तकारणे तेन चाद्येन कर्मणा समानाधिकरणो वेगाख्य सस्कारो जन्यते स च वेगेन गच्छतीति प्रत्यक्षसिद्धएव तेन सस्कारेण तत्रैव कर्म जायते तत्रासमवायिकारण सस्कार समवायिकारणमिषु निमित्तकारणन्तु तीव्रो नोदनविशेष एवञ्च यावदिषु पतनमनुवर्त्तमानेन सस्कारेण उत्तरोत्तर कर्मसन्तानो जायते स्वजन्योत्तरसयोगेन कर्मणि नष्टे सस्कारेण कर्मान्तरजननात् एक एव सस्कार कर्मसन्तानजनक नतु कर्म संतानवत् सस्कारसन्तानो ऽप्यभ्युपगन्तुमुचितो गौरवादिति दर्शयितुमाह । तथोत्तरमुत्तरञ्चेति तत्कर्मकारिताच्चसस्कारादित्यस्य वचनञ्च न्यायनये कर्मसन्तानवत सस्कारसन्तानस्वीकारे गौरवम यत्तु युगपत् प्रक्षिप्तयोरेकस्य ताद्रागमो ऽपरस्य तु मन्दस्तत्र नोदनतीव्रत्वमन्दत्वे निमित्तम ॥

of self repro luctions lil e the succession of actions for the hypothesis is unneces ary To show this the words In like manner the next and the next are added and term Self reproduction caused by that action is in the singular number In the *Nyáya* doctrine which affirms a *succession of self reproductions* like the succession of actions there is complexity (or a violation of the law of parcimony) The reason that of two arrows simultaneously discharged the velocity of the one is swift and that of the other slow is the swiftness or slowness of the impetus U

संस्काराभावे गुरुत्वात् पतनम् ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 Falling results from gravity in the absence of *self reproduction*

[1] It might be objected that in such a case the arrow would continue in motion and never fall The answer is as *follows* There being *non existence that is destruction of the self reproduction*, the velocity produced by the first action from gravity as its cause, there results falling in an arrow &c that is the time during which the particular velocity lasts determined as the final moment destroys such velocity In some cases also conjunction with another substance is destructive of velocity It was in consequence then, *of the existence of a preventive velocity* that there was *no previous fall of the arrow* &c, but a succession of motions There was in consequence of the destruction of the cause of the action of moving no subsequent movement but falling results from the absence of an obstructive In this there is no impossibility V

[1] नन्वेव शरश्चिरमेव गच्छेत कदाचिदपि न पतेदित्यत आह । संस्कारस्याद्यकर्म्मजनितस्य वेगस्य अभावे नाशे सति गुरुत्वात् कारणादेव पतनं शरादेा जायते इत्यर्थं यादृशवेगविशेषेा यावन्त कालन्तिष्ठति तावानेवकालो ऽन्तिमक्षणावच्छिन्नस्तादृश वेगं नाशयति क्वचित्तु द्रव्यान्तरसंयेागेा ऽपि वेगनाशक तथा च प्रतिबन्धकस्य वेगस्य सत्त्वादेव पूर्व्वं शरादेर्न पतनं किन्तु गतिसन्तान एवाभूत उत्तरकालन्तु गमनकर्म्मणा कारणविनाशान्नगमन किन्तु प्रतिबन्धकाभावात पतनमेव भवतीति न किञ्चिदनुपपन्नम ॥

SECOND DAILY-LESSON

नोदनापीडनात् संयुक्तसंयोगाच्च पृथिव्यां कर्म ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Action in earth results from impulse, impact, and conjunction with the conjunct

[1] In earth, in a bamboo &c, action is sometimes produced by the impulse of fire &c, and sometimes from the impact of an axe &c Similarly action is produced in a chariot &c through conjunction with the conjunct through conjunction with the harness conjunct with the horses as they move In the first of these instances, that of action in a bamboo &c, the impulse of fire &c, is the non coinherent cause, the bamboo &c., the co-inherent cause, destiny the efficient cause In the second the blow with the hatchet &c, is the non-coinherent cause. In the third, conjunction with the harness conjunct with the horses is the non-coinherent cause V.

तद्विशेषेणादृष्टकारितम् ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 That action which is produced in a different manner from these, is caused by destiny

[2] That which, as an earthquake &c, is produced in a different manner, to the exclusion of these of impulse, impact and conjunction with the conjunct, is caused by destiny, i e has for its non coinherent cause conjunction with soul destined, since it is the destiny of him to whom pleasure or pain results from the earthquake, that is the particular cause of the earthquake V

---

[1] पृथिव्यां वंशादौ कदाचिद्वह्न्यादिनोदनात् कर्म जायते कदाचिच्च कुठाराद्यभिघातात् एवं संयुक्तसंयोगात् अश्वादिसंयुक्तरज्जुसंयोगात् रथादौ कर्म जायते तत्र प्रथमे वंशादिकर्मणि वह्न्यादिनोदनमसमवायिकारणम् वंशादि समवायिकारणम् अदृष्टादिकं निमित्तकारणम् द्वितीये कुठाराद्यभिघातोऽसमवायिकारणम् तृतीये ऽश्वसंयुक्तरज्जुसंयोगोऽसमवायिकारणमिति ॥

[2] तेषां नोदनाभिघातसंयुक्तसंयोगानां विशेषेण व्यतिरेकेण जातं यत् भूकम्पादिकं कर्म तत् अदृष्टकारितम् अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकमित्यर्थः भूकम्पेन यस्य सुखं दुःखं वा भवति तददृष्टस्य तत्रासाधारणकारणत्वादिति भावः ॥

अपा सयोगाभावे गुरुत्वात् पतनम ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The falling of water results from gravity in the absence *of conjunction*

[1] The section investigative of action co inherent in fluids is here commenced In this it is stated that the falling of water in the form of rain, has gravity for its non coinherent cause This takes place when there is absence of conjunction, of conjunction with a cloud The absence of conjunction is, therefore the efficient cause U

द्रवत्वात् स्यन्दनम् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Flowing results from fluidity

[2] It may be asked how there is in drops of rain action productive of mutual conjunction The answer is therefore given The flowing or distant progression of the stream or great aqueous whole composed by mutual conjunction of the fallen waters or raindrops, is produced by fluidity as its non coinherent cause and by gravity as its efficient cause, in the waters as its co inherent or material cause U

नाड्यो वायुसयोगादारोहणम् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 The sun's rays cause the ascent of water through conjunction with air

नोदनापीडनात् सयुक्तसयोगाच्च ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Through the impress of the impulse, and conjunction *with the conjunct*

---

[1] इदानीं द्रवद्रव्यसमवेतकर्मपरीक्षाप्रकरणम तत्राह। अपा यत् पतन वर्षणरूप तद् गुरुत्वासमवायिकारणकम तत संयोगस्य मेघसयोगस्याभावे सति भवति तेन सयोगाभावस्तन्निमित्तकारणमित्यर्थ ॥

[2] बिन्दूनां पतितानामपा बिन्दूना परस्पर सयोगेन महज्जलावयविस्रोतोरूप यज्जायते तस्य यत् स्यन्दन दूरसरणम् तत द्रवत्वादसमवायिकारणादुत्पद्यते गुरुत्वान्निमित्तकारणादसमवायिकारणेषु ॥

[1] It may be asked how the sun's rays have such power as to draw up waters situated on the earth Through the impress the congress by means of the impulse, the impulse of a strong wind waters conjunct with the sun's rays conjunct with the wind, fly upwards, as the rays of fire driven by the wind draw up boiling water in a caldron The particle and means as, and the example of water in a caldron is to be considered U

वृक्षाभिसर्पणमित्यदृष्टकारितम् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 The circulation in trees is caused by destiny

[2] The circulation in tree of waters sprinkled on the root is caused by destiny The action by which the waters rise and cause the growth of the tree, results from conjunction of destiny with the souls of those in whose souls pleasure or pain is effected by the growth of the leaves, stem, fruit, flowers &c., as its non coinherent cause, from destiny as its efficient cause, and in water as its co inherent cause U

अपा सङ्घातो विलयनञ्च तेजसयोगात् ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 The freezing and thawing of water results from conjunction with light.

---

[1] ननु यदि भूमिष्ठानामपाम ऊर्ध्वं गमन भवति तदा गुरुत्वात् पतनं कथं न स्यात् तदेव तु कुतइत्यत आह कारयन्तीति शेष यदपामूर्ध्वमारोहणं तत् नाड्या सूर्यरश्मयो वायुसयोगात् कारयन्ति ग्रीष्मे वाय्वभिहता सूर्यरश्मयस्य आरोहयन्त्यप इत्यर्थं क्वचित पाठो नाड्यवायुसयोगादिति स च नाडी नाडीसम्बन्धीयो वायुसयोग इत्युपपादनीय ॥

ननु सूर्यरश्मीनां कथमय महिमा यत् भूमिष्ठा अपऊर्ध्वं नयन्तीत्यत आह । नोदनेन बलवद्वायुनोदनेन आपीडनादास्कन्दनात् वायुसयुक्ता रश्मयस्तत्सयुक्ता आपऊर्ध्वं धावन्ति यथा स्थालीस्था अप क्वथ्यमाना वायुनुन्नवह्निरश्मय ऊर्ध्वं नयन्ति चकार इवार्थस्तत्र च उपमान स्थालीयाएवापो द्रष्टव्या. ॥

[2] अभित सर्पणमभिसर्पणं तदभिसर्पणं मूले निषिक्तानामपां वृक्षे तददृष्टकारितं पत्रकाण्डफलपुष्पादिवृद्धिरुत सुख दु ख वा येषामात्मना अदृष्टवत्तदात्मसयोगादसमवायिकारणात अदृष्टान्निमित्तादप्सु समवायिकारणेषु तत कर्म भवति येन कर्मणा आप ऊर्द्ध गत्वा वृक्ष वर्द्धयन्तीत्यर्थं ॥

[1] Aqueous atoms originating a binary atomic aggregate in consequence of being impeded by the light of the sky, do not originate in these aggregates fluidity Snow, hail &c void of fluidity are thus originated by constituent elements void of fluidity, and successively by binary and other aggregates They are consequently observed to be hard It might be asked what proof there is that snow hail &c are water The words and thawing from conjunction with light are therefore added Action is produced in the atoms originative of snow hail &c by powerful conjunction with light. From this action results disjunction Then in the course of destruction of the originative conjunction results destruction of the larger constituent parts of the snow, hail &c Next in consequence of the departure of the conjunction with light which prevents fluidity, these same atoms originate fluidity in the binary atomic aggregates, from which results the thawing of the snow, and hail &c thus endowed with fluidity Of this the efficient cause is the powerful ingress of light U

तत्र विस्फूर्जथुर्लिङ्गम् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 In these the rolling of thunder is a mark

[2] In these—in the waters of the sky—the rolling of thunder is a mark of the ingress of the light of the sky that is it is the pealing of thunder which warrants the inference The excessive

[1] दिव्येन तेजसा प्रतिबन्धादाप्याः परमाणवो द्व्यणुकमारभमाणा द्व्यणुकेषु द्रवत्वं नारभन्ते ततो द्रवत्वशून्यैरवयवैर्द्व्यणुकादिप्रक्रमेण द्रवत्वशून्या हिमकरकादय आरभ्यन्ते तेन तेषां काठिन्यमुपलभ्यते न चैतद् हिमकरकादीनामाप्यत्वे किं प्रमाणमत उक्तं विलयनञ्च तेजःसंयोगादिति तेजःसंयोगेन बलवता हिमकरकारम्भकपरमाणूनां क्रिया क्रियातो विभागस्ततश्चारम्भकसंयोगनाशपरम्परया हिमकरकादिमहावयविनाशस्तत्र द्रवत्वप्रतिबन्धकतेजःसंयोगविगमात् तएव परमाणवः द्व्यणुकेषु द्रवत्वमारभन्ते ततो द्रवत्ववता हिमकरकादिना विलयनं तत्र च बलवत्तेजोनुप्रवेशो निमित्तम् ॥

[2] तत्र दिव्यासु अप्सु दिव्यानां तेजसामनुप्रवेशे विस्फूर्ज्जथुर्लिङ्गं वज्रनिर्घोष एव लिङ्गमित्यर्थः आत्यन्तिकविद्युत्प्रकाशस्तावत्प्रत्यक्ष एव तदनुपदञ्च स्फूर्ज्जथुः सोऽपि प्रत्यक्ष एव तेनानुमीयते यस्मात्संघातं करकाः प्रादुर्भवन्ति तत्र दिव्यन्तेजो विद्युद्रूपमनुप्रविष्टं तदुपष्टम्भेन करकारम्भकाणामपां द्रवत्वप्रतिबन्ध इति ॥

brilliance of lightning is perceptible, and after that follows the thunder which also is perceptible It is therefore inferred that lightning the light of the sky, has entered into the cloud from which the hailstones appear In consequence of this is the prevention of fluidity in the water originative of hail U

वैदिकञ्च ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 There is also Vedic [authority establishing this]

अपा संयोगाद्विभागाच्च स्तनयित्नोः ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11 [The rolling of thunder results] from conjunction with water and disjunction from a cloud

[1] It may be asked how thunder is produced, for no impact nor any kind of disjunction causative of sound is observed. The answer is here given Thunder results from conjunction with water, that is from its being struck by wind, and from disjunction from a cloud V

पृथिवीकर्मणा तेजःकर्म वायुकर्म च व्याख्यातम् ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 The action of light and the action of air, are explained by the action of earth

[2] Conjunction with soul destined has been pronounced the cause of earthquakes In like manner in the case of the action which is produced in light which causes a sudden conflagration, and in wind which causes a sudden agitation of trees &c., the non coinherent cause is conjunction with soul influenced by destiny, air and fire are the coinherent causes, and destiny is the efficient cause U

---

[1] ननु शब्दकारणस्याभिघातस्य विभागविशेषस्य चाननुभवात् विस्फूर्ज्जथु कथमुत्पद्यते इत्यत आह अपा जलाना संयोगात् अर्थाद्वायुना अभिघातात् स्तनयित्नोर्मेघाच्च विभागात् विस्फूर्ज्जथुर्भवतीत्यर्थ ॥

[2] भूकम्प प्रत्यदृष्टवदात्मसंयोग कारणमुक्तम तत्रैवाकस्मिकदिग्दाहहेतोस्तेजस आकस्मिकवृक्षादिचलनहेतोश्च प्रभञ्जनस्य कर्म यत् सञ्जायते तत्राप्यदृष्टवदात्मसंयोग असमवायिकारणम वायुतेजसी समवायिकारणम अदृष्टं निमित्तकारणमित्यर्थ ॥

अग्नेरूर्ध्वज्वलनं वायोस्तिर्यक्पवनमणूनां मनसश्चाद्यं कर्मादृष्ट-कारितम् ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 The upward flaming of fire, the sideward blowing of wind, and the first action of atoms and of the internal organ, are caused by destiny

[1] The word first means existing in the earliest time of creation There being no impulse, impact &c, at that time, it is conjunction with soul influenced by destiny that is in the e the non-coinherent cause The word first applies also to blazing upwards and blowing sidewards It is proper to hold that velocity is the cause of other actions of blazing and blowing, for there being a visible cause, there is no occasion for an unseen cause (or destiny as a cause.) U.

हस्तकर्मणा मनसः कर्म व्याख्यातम् ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 The action of the internal organ is explained by the action of the hand

[2] As the action of the hand in the throwing upwards of a pestle &c., has for its non-coinherent cause conjunction with soul possessing will, in like manner the action of the mind which has for its purpose contact with the organ percipient of the desired object, also has for its non-coinherent cause conjunction with soul exerting volition Although the internal sensory as an organ is not an immediate object of volition it is to be considered that action is produced in the internal sensory by volition acting upon the channel which conveys the internal organ It must be admitted

[1] आद्यमिति सर्गाद्यकालीनमित्यर्थं तदानीं नोदनाभिघातादीनामभावात् अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोग एव तत्रासमवायिकारणम् आद्यमूर्ध्वज्वलनम् आद्यं तिर्यक् पवनमिति इतरेषां ज्वलनपवनकर्मणां वेगासमवायिकारणकत्वमेव मन्तुमुचितं दृष्टे कारणे सत्यदृष्टकल्पनानवकाशात् ॥

[2] मुषलोत्क्षेपणादौ यथा प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकं हस्तकर्म तथाऽभिमतविषयग्राहकेन्द्रियेण संनिकर्षार्थं यन्मनसः कर्म तदपि प्रयत्नवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकमेव यद्यपीन्द्रियं मनो न साक्षात् प्रयत्नविषयस्तथापि मनोवहनाडीगोचरेण प्रयत्नेन मनसि कर्मोत्पत्तिर्द्रष्टव्या नाडीनां त्वगिन्द्रियग्राह्यत्वमङ्गीकर्त्तव्यम् अन्यथा प्राणवहनाडीगोचरेण प्रयत्नेनाशितपीताद्यभ्यवहरणमपि न सम्भवेत् ॥

that this channel is perceptible to the sense of touch, else the transmission of what is eaten and drunk, by means of volition acting upon the channel of the breath would be impossible V

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोऽर्थसन्निकर्षात सुखदुःखम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 *Pleasure and pain result from contact of soul, sense, mind and object*

[1] Pleasure and pain imply other states Cognitions and volitions are also to be considered The infinity of the internal organ has been previously disproved and its atomic minuteness proved *It has been stated that the impossibility of simultaneous cognitions is the mark of the existence of an internal organ* There can then be no pleasure and pain without conjunction with the internal sensory determined to such and such an organ of sense Were there no action in the internal organ there could be no feeling such as of pleasure in the foot of pain in the head &c Although every particular attribute of the soul depends upon contact with the internal organ pleasure and pain are alone expressly mentioned, these being in consequence of their producing acute affections more obtrusive than the others. U

तदनारम्भ आत्मस्थे मनसि शरीरस्य दुःखाभावः संयोगः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Absence of action in the internal sensory reposing in the soul, non existence of pain in the body —this is union

[2] *It might be objected that if the internal sensory be of a* mobile nature *it must be impossible to* restrain *it and consequently a* system of meditation must be useless emancipation

---

[1] सुखदुःखे इत्युपलक्षणं ज्ञानप्रयत्नावपि द्रष्टव्यौ मनसो वैभवं पूर्व्वमेव निराकृतं अणुत्वञ्च साधितम् युगपत् ज्ञानानुत्पत्तिश्च मनसो लिङ्गमित्युक्तं तेन तत्तदिन्द्रिय प्रदेशेन मनःसंयोगमन्तरेण सुखदुःखे न स्यातामेव यदि मनसि कर्म्म न भवेत् न भवेच्च पादे मे सुखं शिरसि मे वेदनेत्याद्याकारोऽनुभव इत्यर्थः यद्यपि मनःसन्निकर्षाधीनाः सर्व्वेऽप्यात्मविशेषगुणास्तथापि सुखदुःखे तीव्रसंवेगितया अतिस्फुटत्वादुक्ते ॥

[2] ननु मनश्चेत् चञ्चलस्वभावं तदा तस्य निरोधो न सम्भवति तथा च योगमन्तरेणात्मसाक्षात्कारस्यासम्भवादपवर्गस्यासम्भवेन मननशास्त्रं निष्प्रयोजनमापद्येतेत्याशङ्कायामाह । आत्मस्थे मनसि यद्योगेन इन्द्रियादिकं परित्यज्य मनो यदा आत्म

being impossible since a presentation of soul is impossible To this an answer is furnished When the internal sensory abides in the soul when by sixfold union the internal sensory quitting the exterior organs &c abides in the soul alone there results the non commencement or non production of the action of the internal sensory The sensory then becomes immovable In this state there is non existence of pain in the body, that is pain is not produced in relation to the body This is called the conjunction or union with soul of the internal organ excluded from all things external This is established by the words of the Skanda purana — The internal organ is smitten by the breath he should not therefore sigh He should therefore restrain his breath for the sake of immobility of the interior sensory That he may restrain his breath, let him practise sixfold union Sitting checking the vital airs, abstraction suspension of the faculties meditation and contemplation —these are the six elements of union After this then there being cessation of false cognition by the arising of a presentation of soul final emancipation is unimpeded and a system of meditation is not therefore fruitless V

अपसर्पणमुपसर्पणमशितपीतसंयोगाः कार्यान्तरसंयोगाश्चेत्यदृष्टकारितानि ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 The egress and ingress (of internal sensories from and into bodies) conjunctions with things eaten and drunk, and conjunctions with other effects —all these things are caused by destiny

[1] Egress the issuing forth of the internal organ from the

मात्रंतिष्ठति तदा तदनारम्भ तस्य मन कर्म्मणामनारम्भ अनुत्पाद तदा मनो निश्चलं भवति तदवस्थाया शरीरस्य दु खाभाव शरीरावच्छेदेन दु ख न जायते स आत्मना बाह्यव्यावृत्तमनस संयोगो योग उच्यते तया च तदनन्तरमात्मसाक्षात्कारोदयेन मिथ्याज्ञानादिनि वृत्तौ सत्यामपवर्गो निष्प्रत्यूह एधति न मननशास्त्र निष्फलमिति भाव ॥

[1] अपसर्पण मरणावस्थाया देहान्मनस उत्क्रमणम उपसर्पण देहान्तरोत्पत्तौ तत्र मनस प्रवेश अशितपीतयोरन्नजलयो संयोगा कार्यान्तराणामिन्द्रियप्राणाना देहेन सह संयोगाश्च यस्मात कर्म्मणो भवन्ति इति पूरणीयम इति एतानि कर्म्माणि अदृष्टकारितानि अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकाणि ॥

that this channel is perceptible to the sense of touch, else the transmission of what is eaten and drunk, by means of volition acting upon the channel of the breath, would be impossible V

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोऽर्थसन्निकर्षात् सुखदुःखम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 Pleasure and pain result from contact of soul, sense, mind and object.

[1] Pleasure and pain imply other states Cognitions and volitions are also to be considered The infinity of the internal organ has been previously disproved, and its atomic minuteness proved It has been stated that the impossibility of simultaneous cognitions is the mark of the existence of an internal organ There can, then, be no pleasure and pain without conjunction with the internal sensory determined to such and such an organ of sense Were there no action in the internal organ there could be no feeling, such as of pleasure in the foot, of pain in the head &c Although every particular attribute of the soul depends upon contact with the internal organ, pleasure and pain are alone expressly mentioned, these being in consequence of their producing acute affections, more obtrusive than the others U

तदनारम्भ आत्मस्थे मनसि शरीरस्य दुःखाभावः संयोगः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Absence of action in the internal sensory reposing in the soul, non existence of pain in the body,—this is union

[2] It might be objected that if the internal sensory be of a mobile nature it must be impossible to restrain it and consequently a system of meditation must be useless emancipation

[1] सुखदुःखे इत्युपलक्षणं ज्ञानप्रयत्नाद्यपि द्रष्टव्यं मनसो वैभवं पूर्व्वमेव निराकृतं अणुत्वञ्च साधितम् युगपत् ज्ञानानुत्पत्तिश्च मनसो लिङ्गमित्युक्तं तेन तत्तदिन्द्रियप्रदेशेन मनःसंयोगमन्तरेण सुखदुःखे न स्यातामेव यदि मनसि कर्म्म न भवेत न भवेच्च पादे मे सुखं शिरसि मे वेदनेत्याद्याकारो ऽनुभवइत्यर्थं यद्यपि मनःसन्निकर्षाधीनः सर्व्वोऽप्यात्मविशेषगुणस्तथापि सुखदुःखे तीव्रसंवेगितया अतिस्फुटत्वादुक्तं ॥

[2] ननु मनश्चेत् चञ्चलस्वभावं तदा तस्य निरोधो न सम्भवति तथा च योगमन्तरेणात्मसाक्षात्कारस्यासम्भवादपवर्गस्यासम्भवेन मननशास्त्रं निष्प्रयोजनमापद्येतेत्याशङ्कायामाह । आत्मस्थे मनसि यदङ्गयोगेन इन्द्रियादिकं परित्यज्य मनो यदा आत्म

being impossible since a presentation of soul is impossible To this an answer is furnished When the internal sensory abides in the soul when by sixfold union the internal sensory quitting the exterior organs &c abides in the soul alone there results the non commencement or non production of the action of the internal sensory The sensory then becomes immovable In this state there is non existence of pain in the body, that is pain is not produced in relation to the body This is called the conjunction or union with soul of the internal organ excluded from all things external This is established by the words of the Skandha purána — The internal organ is smitten by the breath he should not therefore sigh He should therefore restrain his breath for the sake of immobility of the interior sensory That he may restrain his breath, let him practise sixfold union Sitting checking the vital airs, abstraction suspension of the faculties meditation and contemplation —these are the six elements of union After this then there being cessation of false cognition by the arising of a presentation of soul final emancipation is unimpeded and a system of meditation is not therefore fruitless V

अपसर्पणमुपसर्पणमशितपीतसंयोगाः कार्यान्तरसंयोगाश्चेत्यदृष्टकारितानि ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 The egress and ingress (of internal sensories from and into bodies) conjunctions with things eaten and drunk and conjunctions with other effects —all these things are caused by destiny

[1] Egress the issuing forth of the internal organ from the

मात्मनि तिष्ठति तदा तदनारम्भः तस्य मनः कर्म्मणोऽनारम्भः अनुत्पाद तदा मनो निश्चलं भवति तदवस्थायां शरीरस्य दुःखाभाव शरीरावच्छेदेन दुःख न जायते स आत्मना बाह्यव्यावृत्तमनस संयोगो योग उच्यते तथा च तदनन्तरमात्मसाक्षात्कारोदयेन मिथ्याज्ञानादिनि वृत्तौ सत्यामपवर्गो निष्प्रत्यूह एवेति न मननशास्त्रं निष्फलमिति भाव ॥

[1] अपसर्पणं मरणावस्थायां देहान्मनस उत्क्रमणम् उपसर्पणं देहान्तरोत्पत्तौ तत्र मनस प्रवेश अशितपीतयोरन्नजलयो संयोगा कार्य्यान्तराणामिन्द्रियप्राणानां देहेन सह संयोगाश्च यस्मात् कर्म्मणो भवन्ति इति पूरणीयम् इति एतानि कर्म्माणि अदृष्टकारितानि अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकाणि ॥

that this channel is perceptible to the sense of touch, else the transmission of what is eaten and drunk, by means of volition acting upon the channel of the breath would be impossible V

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोऽर्थसन्निकर्षात् सुखदुःखम् ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 Pleasure and pain result from contact of soul sense mind and object

[1] Pleasure and pain imply other states Cognitions and volitions are also to be considered The infinity of the internal organ has been previously disproved and its atomic minuteness proved It has been stated that the impossibility of simultaneous cognitions is the mark of the existence of an internal organ There can then be no pleasure and pain without conjunction with the internal sensory determined to such and such an organ of sense Were there no action in the internal organ there could be no feeling such as of pleasure in the foot of pain in the head &c Although every particular attribute of the soul depends upon contact with the internal organ pleasure and pain are alone expressly mentioned, these being in consequence of their producing acute affections, more obtrusive than the others U

तदनारम्भ आत्मस्थे मनसि शरीरस्य दुःखाभावः संयोगः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Absence of action in the internal sensory reposing in the soul non existence of pain in the body,—this is union

[2] It might be objected that if the internal sensory be of a mobile nature it must be impossible to restrain it and consequently a system of meditation must be useless emancipation

[1] सुखदुःखे इत्युपलक्षणं ज्ञानप्रयत्नावपि द्रष्टव्यौ मनसो वैभवं पूर्वमेव निराकृतं अणुत्वञ्च साधितं युगपत् ज्ञानानुत्पत्तिश्च मनसो लिङ्गमित्युक्तं तेन तत्तदिन्द्रियप्रदेशेन मनःसंयोगमन्तरेण सुखदुःखे न स्यातामेव यदि मनसि कर्म न भवेत् न भवेच्च पादे मे सुखं शिरसि मे वेदनेत्याद्याकारोऽनुभवस्तथं यद्यपि मनःसन्निकर्षाधीनं सर्व्वोऽप्यात्मविशेषगुणस्तथापि सुखदुःखे तीव्रसंवेगितया ऽतिस्फुटत्वादुक्ते ॥

[2] ननु मनश्चेत् चञ्चलस्वभावं तदा तस्य निरोधो न सम्भवति तथा च योगमन्तरेणात्मसाक्षात्कारस्यासम्भवादपवर्गस्यासम्भवेन मननशास्त्रं निष्प्रयोजनमापद्येतेत्याशङ्कायामाह । आत्मस्थे मनसि षडङ्गयोगेन इन्द्रियादिकं परित्यज्य मनो यदा आत्म

being impossible since a presentation of soul is impossible To this an answer is furnished When the internal sensory abides in the soul when by sixfold union the internal sensory quitting the exterior organs &c abides in the soul alone there results the non commencement or non production of the action of the internal sensory The sensory then becomes immovable In this state there is non existence of pain in the body, that is pain is not produced in relation to the body This is called the conjunction or union with soul of the internal organ excluded from all things external This is established by the words of the Skanda purana — The internal organ is smitten by the breath he should not therefore sigh He should therefore restrain his breath for the sake of immobility of the interior sensory That he may restrain his breath, let him practise sixfold union Sitting checking the vital airs, abstraction suspension of the faculties meditation and contemplation —these are the six elements of union After this then there being cessation of false cognition by the arising of a presentation of soul final emancipation is unimpeded and a system of meditation is not therefore fruitless V

अपसर्पणमुपसर्पणमशितपीतसंयोगाः कार्यान्तरसंयोगाश्चेत्यदृष्टकारितानि ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 The egress and ingress (of internal sensories from and into bodies) conjunctions with things eaten and drunk and conjunctions with other effects —all these things are caused by destiny

[1] Egress the issuing forth of the internal organ from the

मात्रेतिष्ठति तदा तदनारम्भः तस्य मनः कर्मणामनारम्भः अनुत्पादः तदा मनो निश्चलं भवति तदवस्थायां शरीरस्य दुःखाभावः शरीरावच्छेदेन दुःखं न जायते स आत्मना बाह्यव्यावृत्तमनसः संयोगो योग उच्यते तथा च तदनन्तरमात्मसाक्षात्कारोदयेन मिथ्याज्ञानादिनिवृत्तौ सत्यामपवर्गो निष्प्रत्यूह एवेति न मननशास्त्रं निष्फलमिति भावः ॥

[1] अपसर्पणं मरणावस्थायां देहान्मनसः उत्क्रमणम् उपसर्पणं देहान्तरोत्पत्तौ तत्र मनसः प्रवेशः अशितपीतयोरन्नजलयोः संयोगाः कार्यान्तराणामिन्द्रियप्राणानां देहेन सह संयोगाश्च यस्मात् कर्मणो भवन्ति इति पुराणीयम् इति एतानि कर्माणि अदृष्टकारितानि अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगासमवायिकारणकाणि ॥

body at the time of death, ingress the entrance of the internal organ into another body when it is produced, conjunctions with food and water eaten and drunk, and conjunctions of other effects, with the body that is of the sensual organs and vital airs, the actions from which these conjunctions arise for these words are to be supplied —these actions are caused by destiny, that is, have for their non-coinherent cause conjunction with soul destined V

तदभावे संयोगाभावोऽप्रादुर्भावश्च मोक्षः ॥ १८ ॥

Aph. 18 Where there is non existence of this (that is of destiny) there is non-existence of conjunction, and non existence of manifestation emancipation [1]

[1] Where there is non existence of this that is of destiny where there is destruction of other than fructescent results of actions by presentation of soul and of fructescent results by fruition there is non-existence of conjunction a severance from connection with the stream or series of bodies After this there is non manifestation that is to say non production of pain and from the absence of the body and of destiny as causes at that time emancipation or liberation is possible. Emancipation therefore is not chimerical like the horns of a hare V

Darkness.

द्रव्यगुणकर्मनिष्पत्तिवैधर्म्यादभावस्तमः ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 Darkness is a non entity being dissimilar to the production of substance quality and action

[2] It may be objected The action of a substance is observed also in darkness there being such cognitions as The shadow moves.

---

[1] तदभावे तस्यादृष्टस्याभावे सति प्रारब्धेतरादृष्टानामात्मसाक्षात्कारेण प्रारब्धानाञ्च भोगेन क्षये सतीति यावत् संयोगाभावः देहप्रवाहसम्बन्धस्य विच्छेदस्ततश्च अप्रादुर्भावः अर्थाद् दुःखानुत्पत्तिर्देहरूपस्यादृष्टरूपस्य च कारणस्य विरहादिति तदानीं मोक्षः अपवर्गः सम्भवतीति नापवर्गस्य शशविषाणसमानत्वमिति भावः ॥

[2] ननु तमस्यपि द्रव्यस्य कर्म दृश्यते चलति छायेति प्रत्ययात् तत्र न प्रयत्नो न वा नोदनाभिघातौ न वा गुरुत्वद्रवत्वेन वा संस्कारस्तथा च निमित्तान्तरं वक्तव्यं तच्च

In such cases there is no volition no impulse or impact, and no gravity or fluidity, another efficient cause must therefore be posited, but this does not appear. The reply is here supplied. By this also is confirmed the observation that there are only nine substances. The production of substances is dependent only on tangible substances and no touch is observed in darkness. Nor is there in darkness a touch but inappreciable touch, for where colour is appreciable touch must also needs be appreciable. If it be objected that this is the rule with regard to earth but darkness is a tenth substance, we reply that this is not the case for no other substance is a substratum of blue colour, and gravity is inseparable from blue colour, as also are taste and smell. If it be urged that as ether has sound only as its differencing attribute and darkness may in like manner have blue colour for its peculiar property we reply that it is not so for there is a contradiction to visibility, for were darkness merely something possessing blue colour, or blue colour it would not be perceived by the eye without an accompanying perception of external light. U

तेजसो द्रव्यान्तरेणावरणाच्च ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 And because of the obscuration of light by another substance

[1] It may be asked What then occasions the notion of motion

नानुभूयमानमित्यत आह । एतेन नवैव द्रव्याणीत्यवधारणमप्युपपादितं द्रव्यनिष्पत्तिस्तावत् स्पर्शवद्द्रव्याधीना न च तमसि स्पर्शोऽनुभूयते न चानुद्भूतस्य स्पर्शः रूपोद्भवे स्पर्शोद्भवस्यावश्यकत्वात् पृथिव्यामेव नियमः मतस्तु दशमं द्रव्यमिति चेन्न द्रव्यान्तरस्य नीलरूपानधिकरणत्वात् नीलरूपस्य च गुरुत्वनान्तरीयकत्वात् रसगन्धनान्तरीयकत्वात् यथाकाशं शब्दमात्रविशेषगुणं तथा तमोऽपि नीलरूपमात्रविशेषगुणं स्यादिति चेन्न चाक्षुषत्वविरोधात् यदि हि नीलरूपवदेव रूपमेव वा तमः स्यात् बाह्यालोकप्रग्रहमन्तरेण चक्षुषा न गृह्येत ॥

[1] तर्हि गतिप्रतीतिः किंनिबन्धनेत्यत आह गच्छता द्रव्यान्तरेणावृते तेजसि पूर्वदेशानुपलम्भादपरदेशे चोपलम्भात्तेजोऽभावस्य गच्छद्द्रव्यसाधर्म्याद् गतिभ्रमो न तु वास्तवी तत्र गतिरित्यर्थः अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां तथा प्रतीतेः उद्भूतरूपवदालोकसंसर्गाभावस्तमः ॥

of darkness? The reply is therefore furnished Light being obscured by another substance in motion and non existence of light not being observed in the east and being observed in the west and thus resembling a moving substance an erroneous conception of motion results but there is no real motion in the case for this appears from an inclusive and exclusive argument Darkness is absolute non existence of all light in that which possesses appreciable colour U

दिक्कालावाकाशञ्च क्रियावद्वैधर्म्यान्निष्क्रियाणि ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 Space time and ether, are also inactive being dissimilar to that which possesses action

[1] The collateral section comprising two aphorisms on darkness being completed the section treating of voidness of action is stated The word also implies the addition of soul. The dissimilarity from that which possesses action is the illimitation of space &c for action resides only in the concrete U

एतेन कर्माणि गुणाश्च व्याख्याता ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 By this are explained actions and qualities

[2] The inactivity of qualities and actions is stated. By this means by dissimilarity from that which possesses action Illimitation the dissimilarity from that which possesses action belongs also to qualities and actions and they also are explained to be inactive U

निष्क्रियाणां समवाय कर्मभ्यो निषिद्ध ॥ २३ ॥

Aph 23 The co inherence of things inactive is excluded from actions

[1] एव द्विसूत्रक प्रासङ्गिक तम प्रकरण समाप्य कर्मशून्यताप्रकरणमाह चकारा दात्मसग्रह क्रियावता वैधर्म्य दिगादीनाममूर्त्तत्व मूर्त्तानुविधानात् क्रियाया ॥

[2] गुणकर्मणोर्निष्क्रियत्वमाह । एतेनेति क्रियावद्वैधर्म्येणेत्यर्थ क्रियावद्वैधर्म्यम मूर्त्तत्व गुणकर्मणारपीतिते अपि निष्क्रियत्वेनव्याख्या इत्यर्थ ॥

[1] It might be objecte l If qualities and actions are inactive how can there be any connection between them and substance? connection by conjunction would be possible but that depends on action only Hence it is stated that co-inherence is the only connection of qualities and actions which are inactive and that this is excluded from actions Of this connection there is not even the production much less dependency upon action U

कारणं त्वसमवायिनो गुणाः ॥ २४ ॥

Aph 24 But qualities as a cause are non coinherent

[2] It might be objected If qualities as being immaterial are not a co inherent cause of actions how are qualities and actions produced by qualities? For causation in the form of being something over and above a co inherent cause is not possible The reply to this is therefore furnished Qualities are a non coinherent cause not a co-inherent cause also that they should be the sites of actions Non coinherent causality sometimes results from co inherence in the same object with the effect as that of conjunction with soul in the particular attributes of sounds or of sound in conjunction and disjunction in sound, in other cases it results from coinherence in the same object with the cause as that of the colours &c of the parts of a water pot &c in the colour &c of a water pot &c. U

गुणैर्दिग्व्याख्याता ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 By qualities space is explained

[1] ननु गुणकर्म्मणी यदि निष्क्रिये तदा ताभ्यां द्रव्यस्य कथं सम्बन्धः संयोगसम्बन्धः सम्भाव्येत स च कर्म्माधीन एवेत्यत आह निष्क्रियाणां गुणकर्म्मणां समवाय एव सम्बन्धः स च कर्म्मभ्यो निषिद्धः तस्य सम्बन्धस्य उत्पत्तिरेव नास्ति दूरे तु कर्म्माधीनत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] ननु मूर्त्तत्वाद् गुणाः कर्म्मसमवायिकारणं भवन्ति तदा गुणैर्गुणाः कर्म्माणि च कथमुत्पद्यन्ते न हि समवायिकारणातिरिक्तत्वरूपेणापि कारणता सम्भवतीत्यत आह गुणा असमवायिकारणं न तु समवायिकारणमपि येन कर्म्माधाराः स्युः सा चासमवायिकारणता क्वचित् कार्य्यैकार्थसमवायात् यथात्ममनःसंयोगस्यात्मविशेषगुणेषु संयोगविभागयोश्च शब्दे क्वचित् कारणैकार्थसमवायात् यथा कपालादिरूपादीनां घटादिरूपादिषु ॥

[1] An objection might be raised· In virtue of such cognitions as Action is produced here Action is produced now, time and space also are co inherent causes of action Else how could they be its site? It is therefore stated that as the qualities gravity &c, being unlimited are not co inherent causes of action so it follows also from its illimitation that space is not a co inherent cause of action That to be a site does not imply co inherence is proved by such instances as those of cotton in a bowl curdled milk in a bowl, the roaring of a lion in a forest U

कारणेन कालः ॥ २६ ॥

Aph 26 By cause time [is explained]

[2] The words Is explained to be inactive are to be supplied according to an altered construction By the words by cause existence is indicated Time then as an efficient cause is merely the site of action but not co inherent with action. U

SIXTH BOOK FIRST DAILY LESSON

बुद्धिपूर्वा वाक्यकृतिर्वेदे ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 There is in the Veda a composition of sentences consequent upon design

---

[1] ननु इह कर्म्मोत्पद्यते इदानीं कर्म्मोत्पद्यते इत्यादि प्रतीतिबलात् दिक्कालावपि कर्म्मसमवायिकारणे एव कथमन्यथा तत्र तयोराधारत्वमित्यत आह । यथा गुरुत्वादयो गुणा न कर्म्मसमवायिकारणममूर्त्तत्वात् तथा दिगपि नकर्म्मसमवायिकारणममूर्त्तत्वादेवेत्यर्थः आधारता तु समवायितामन्तरेणापि कुण्डे बदराणि कुण्डे दधि वने सिंहनादइत्यादिवदुपपद्यते इति भावः ॥

[2] उक्तनैवाभिप्रायेणाह निष्क्रियत्वेन व्याख्यात इति परिणामस्यानुषङ्गः कारणेनेति भावप्रधानो निर्देशः तन निमित्तकारणत्वेनाधारमात्रं कर्म्मणः कालो न तु समवायीत्यर्थः ॥

[1] The object matter of the sixth book is the investigation of merit and demerit the primary causes of transmigration Merit and demerit may be conceived as existing in virtue of such precepts and prohibitions as Let him that desires paradise offer sacrifices, Let him not eat kalanja, assuming the authoritativeness of such injunctions and prohibitions Such authoritativeness is established by the prior existence of the distinguishing attribute in the speaker of accurate knowledge of the meaning of the words Absolute authoritativeness being denied *the author proceeds in the* first place to prove the quality determinant of the Veda Composition of sentences framing of propositions is consequent upon intention, preceded by the speakers accurate knowledge of the meaning of the sentences, because it is a composition of sentences, like the composition by ourselves and others of such sentences as There are five fruits on the rivers bank In the Veda means in the aggregate of sentences Of this the composition of the aggregated sentences is the subject, and there is no unduly assumed causality in the priority of the intention of ourselves and others For in such instances as Let him that desires paradise offer sacrifices the means of attaining the desired object or the fact of its being an effect are not objects of the intellect of ourselves or of our fellow creatures Therefore there is established in the case of the Veda the prior existence of an absolute author and the definition of the Veda is words of authority not derived from knowledge *of the meaning of propositions composed of words*, accompanied

---

[1] संसारमूलकारणयोर्धर्माधर्मयोः परीक्षा षष्ठाध्यायार्थः धर्माधर्मौ च स्वर्गकामो यजेत न च कलञ्जं भक्षयेत इत्यादिविधिनिषेधबलकल्पनीयौ विधिनिषेधवाक्ययोः प्रामाण्ये सति स्याताम् तत्प्रामाण्यञ्च वक्तुर्यथार्थवाक्यार्थज्ञानलक्षणगुणपूर्वकत्वादुपपद्यते स्वतः प्रामाण्यस्य निषेधादतः प्रथमं वेदप्रामाण्यप्रयोजकगुणसाधनमुपक्रमते वाक्यकृतिर्वाक्यरचना सा बुद्धिपूर्वा वक्तृयथार्थवाक्यार्थज्ञानपूर्वा वाक्यरचनात्वात् नदीतीरे पञ्च फलानि सन्तीत्यस्मदादिवाक्यरचनावत् वेद इति वाक्यसमुदाय इत्यर्थः तत्र समुदायिनां वाक्यानां कृतिः पक्षः न चास्मदादिबुद्धिपूर्वकत्वेनान्यथा सिद्धिः स्वर्गकामो यजेत इत्यादाविष्टसाधनताया कार्य्यताया अस्मदादिबुद्ध्यगोचरत्वात् तेन स्वतन्त्रपुरुषपूर्वकत्वं वेदे सिध्यति वेदत्वञ्च शब्दतदुपजीविप्रमाणातिरिक्तप्रमाणजन्यत्वमित्यविषयार्थकत्वे सति शब्दजन्यवाक्यार्थज्ञानाजन्यप्रमाणशब्दत्वम् ॥

L

with the nature of that which is not an object of certain knowledge derived from evidence other than of words and of the evidence upon them dependent U

ब्राह्मणे सञ्ज्ञाकर्म सिद्धिलिङ्गम् ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 The formation of names in the Bráhmana is an evidence of design

[1] It is stated in another manner that the words of the Veda had intelligence as their antecedent The Brahmana here denotes a portion of the Veda The formation there of terms, or making of names points to the intention of the derivatist just as the making in ordinary language of such names as Long-ear Long-nose Long neck U

बुद्धिपूर्वो ददातिः ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The words He gives have intelligence as their antecedent

[2] The injunction to make gifts in such precepts as He that desires paradise should give a cow, is derived from the knowledge of the causal efficiency of such gifts The particular employment of the root in the form He gives, implies giving, the sense of the root U

तथा प्रतिग्रहः ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Likewise reception

[3] The sacred texts enjoining reception also imply an intelli-

---

[1] प्रकारान्तरेण वेदवाक्यानां बुद्धिपूर्वकत्वमाह । ब्राह्मणमिह वेदभागस्तत्र यत् सञ्ज्ञाकर्म नामकरणं तत् व्युत्पादकस्य बुद्धिमाक्षिपति तथा लोके लम्बकर्णदीर्घनासिकदीर्घग्रीवादिनामकरणम् ॥

[2] स्वर्गकामो गां दद्यात् इत्यादौ यद्दानप्रतिपादनं तद्दानेष्टसाधनताज्ञानजन्यं ददातीतीति धातुनिर्देशो धात्वर्थं दानमुपलक्षयति ॥

[3] प्रमाणान्तरमाह । प्रतिग्रहप्रतिपादिका अपि श्रुतयो बुद्धिपूर्विका प्रतिग्रहपदस्वविषया श्रुतिमुपलक्षयति तेन भूम्यादिप्रतिग्रहप्रतिपादिन्य श्रुतय प्रतिग्रहीतुरिष्टसाधनतापरा कृष्णसारचर्मादिप्रतिग्रहप्रतिपादिका श्रुतय प्रतिग्रहीतुरनिष्टसाधनताबोधिका न चेष्टानिष्टसाधनते अर्वाचीनपुरुषबुद्धिगोचरे भवितुमर्हत ॥

gent antecedent The word reception implies a sacred text of which it is the subject Sacred texts enjoining acceptance of lauds &c indicate its efficacy to the welfare of the receiver Sacred texts setting forth the reception of the skin of the black antelope &c, imply efficacy to that which is undesired by the recipient The *efficacy to the desired and the undesired cannot be merely objects in the minds of modern persons* U

आत्मान्तरगुणानामात्मान्तरेऽकारणत्वात् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Because the attributes of one soul are not a cause with regard to another soul

[1] Because the attributes of one soul its merits and demerits such as sacrifices injuries &c. are not a cause of the attributes of pleasure and pain in another soul pleasure and pain are produced by such merit and demerit only as exist in each several soul not by merit and demerit inhering in different subjects Otherwise inasmuch as one by whom a sacrifice was not offered nor a wrong done would receive its recompense there would result a loss of what was done and requital for what was not done U

तद्दुष्टभोजने न विद्यते ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 That does not exist in the case of the eating of the *wicked*

[2] That denotes the fruit of a benediction When evil Brahmans unworthy recipients are fed at the obsequial rites no fruit accrues from this to the ancestor or the meaning is imply that *the result of the obsequial rites does not accrue to the ancestor* U

---

[1] आत्मान्तरगुणानां यागहिंसादिपुण्यपापानामात्मान्तरे ये सुखदुःखात्मको गुणौ तयोरकारणत्वात् एवञ्च प्रत्यात्मनिष्ठानामेव धर्माधर्माभ्यां सुखदुःखे न व्यधिकरणाभ्यामन्यथा येन यागहिंसादिकं न कृतं तस्य तत्फलं स्यादिति कृतहानिरकृताभ्यागमश्च प्रसज्येत ॥

[2] तदित्याशीर्वादफलं परामृशति दुष्टब्राह्मणा पात्रानधिकारिणो यत्र श्राद्धे भोज्यन्ते तत्रापि पितरि तत्फलं न विद्यते न भवतीत्यर्थः श्राद्धफलमेव वा न भवति पितरीत्यर्थः ॥

दुष्ट हिंसायाम ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 The evil has reference to wrong

[1] Has reference to wrong implies prohibited actions in general It shoud therefore be understood that a man occupied in forbidden action is the wicked U

तस्य समभिव्याहारतो दोष. ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Demerit results from association with him

[2] It is stated that not only is there absence of fruit in the partaking of an unworthy Brahman invited to the obsequial rite but also sin accrues Demerit or guilt results from association characterised as eating in the same row sleeping reading and the like together with him i e with a Brahman occupied in illicit action U

तददुष्टे न विद्यते ॥ ९ ॥

Aph. 9 This does not exist in the case of one not unworthy

[3] This guilt does not exist that is, does not accrue in the case of a Brahman not unworthy i e one who acts according to sacred precepts invited to partake in the obsequial rite U

पुनर्विशिष्टे प्रवृत्ति ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 Again the procedure should be in relation to that which is excellent

---

[1] हिंसायामिति निषिद्धकर्ममात्रोपलक्षणम तेन निषिद्धे कर्मणि प्रवृत्त विजानीयादित्यर्थ ॥

[2] न केवल दुष्टब्राह्मणस्य श्राद्धे निमन्त्रितस्य भोजनेन फलाभाव किन्तु पापमपि भवतीत्याह तस्य निषिद्धे कर्मणि प्रवृत्तस्य ब्राह्मणस्य समभिव्याहारात एकपङ्क्तिभोजनसहशयनसहाध्ययनादिलक्षणात दोष पापमित्यर्थ ॥

[3] तत पापमदुष्टे यथाशास्त्र व्यवहारमाणे ब्राह्मणे श्राद्धे भोजते न विद्यते न भवतीत्यर्थ ॥

[1] If excellent persons, those who regulate their conduct according to sacred precepts, are procured at obsequial rites or in receiving gifts, a man should avoid those who are censurable though they may have been invited. The text "A man should not reject those who are invited," refers to worthy recipients. But a man should gratify blameable persons, when invited, by giving money, &c. U.

समे हीने वा प्रवृत्तिः ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11. Again the procedure should be in relation to an equal or an inferior.

[2] Where persons more excellent than oneself are not procured at obsequial rites, it is explained that the procedure in obsequial rites, alms &c., should be in relation to an equal, one like oneself, or an inferior, one less in point of merit &c., than oneself. Persons prohibited are by all means to be avoided, but not the unblemished whether they be equals or inferiors. U.

एतेन हीनसमविशिष्टधार्मिकेभ्यः परस्वादानं व्याख्यातम् ॥ १२ ॥

Aph. 12. By this is explained reception of property from another, from inferior, equal, and superior, virtuous persons.

[3] Merit, a serial increase of merit results in the acquisition of land &c., whether from an inferior, or an equal or one more excel-

---

[1] श्राद्धे प्रतिग्रहे वा विशिष्टा यथाशास्त्रमनुवर्तमाना यदि लभ्यन्ते तदा निमन्त्रितानपि निन्द्यान् परिहृत्य तानेव भोजयेत न निमन्त्रितान् प्रत्याचक्षीत इति तु सत्पात्रपरम निन्द्यास्तु निमन्त्रितान् दक्षिणादानादिना सन्तोषयेत ॥

[2] समे स्वसदृशे हीने स्वापेक्षया गुणादिना न्यूने अदुष्टे पात्रे श्राद्धदानादौ प्रवृत्तिस्तेषामेवार्थाद्धीनात् पितरि सुखमित्यर्थः निषिद्धानां पर त्यागो नत्वादुष्टानां समहीनानामपीति भावः ॥

[3] यथोत्तरं धर्मोत्कर्षः हीनादपि भूम्यादिप्रतिग्रहे समादपि स्वापेक्षया विशिष्टादपि धार्मिकात् धर्म इत्यर्थः परस्वादान परस्मात् स्वस्य धनस्यादानं प्रतिग्रहः प्रतिग्रहस्तु परस्वादान चौर्यादिना परस्वग्रहणं व्याख्यातं तथा च श्रुतिः शूद्रात् सप्तमे वैश्यादष्टमे क्षत्रियात्पञ्चदशे ब्राह्मणात् प्राणसंशये इति क्षुधापीडितमात्मानं कुटुम्बं रक्षितुं सप्तदिनान्याहारमप्राप्य शूद्रस्यापहारः कार्य्यः एव दशदिनान्याहारमप्राप्य वैश्यात पञ्चदशदिनान्याहारमप्राप्य क्षत्रियात् प्राणसंशये ब्राह्मणात भक्ष्यापहरणे न दोषायेत्याह ॥

ent than oneself, being virtuous Acquisition is the reception of property or wealth from another According to the author of the Vritti by the reception of property from another the taking of property by theft &c, is explained In conformity with this is the text From a Śudra on the seventh day from a Vaiśya on the tenth, from a Kshatriya on the fifteenth, from a Bráhman in case of danger to life To save himself or his family when starving a man may steal the food of a Śudra, when he has been without food for seven days, when he has been without food for ten days that of a Vaiśya, when he has been fifteen days without food, that of a Kshatriya When his life is in danger, stealing food from a Bráhman tends not to demerit U

तथा विरुद्धानां त्यागः ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Likewise the making away with those who are contrary

[1] Not only is the taking of others' property, when in danger to life not forbidden but in such circumstances those who do not give anything to take away should even be put to death And by all this there is no loss of merit or manifestation of demerit. In such a case those who are contrary, those who act in the contrary manner are to be put to death Therefore it has been said Let a man save himself when in despair by whatsoever deed fair or foul when he is able let him practise righteousness U

हीने परे त्यागः ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 Making away with another has reference to an inferior

[2] If another who does not give anything to take away is inferior to oneself be the Sudra &c, may be put to death U

---

[1] न केवलं प्राणसंशये परस्वादानं न निषिद्धं किन्तु तस्यां दशायामपहर्त्तुं ये न प्रयच्छन्ति तथा वधोऽपि कार्य्यो न तावता धर्म्महानिरधर्म्मप्रादुर्भावो वेत्यादि तस्यां दशायां विरुद्धानां विपरीतमाचरतां त्यागो वध कार्य्य इत्यर्थः तदुक्तम् कर्म्मणा येन केनापि मृदुना दारुणेन वा उद्धरेद्दीनमात्मानं समर्थो धर्म्ममाचरेत् इति ॥

[2] यदि स्वस्माद्धीनः परो भवति योऽपहर्त्तुं न ददाति तस्य शूद्रादेस्त्यागो वध

समे आत्मत्यागः परत्यागो वा ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 In the case of an equal suicide or the destruction of the other

[1] If the opposite party be one's equal—but only if he be a Brahman—in such a case suicide—the destruction of oneself by fasting &c —is to be committed. If there appear no means of preserving oneself or one's family and the opposite party be an equal he is to be made away with or destroyed. U

विशिष्टे आत्मत्याग इति ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 In the case of a superior suicide [is to be committed.]

[2] In the case of an opposite party superior to oneself distinguished by study of the Veda &c suicide alone is lawful though there be danger to life a man may design only his own death but must not slay a Brahman. U

SECOND DAILY LESSON

दृष्टादृष्टप्रयोजनानां दृष्टाभावे प्रयोजनमभ्युदयाय ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Of action of which the motives are seen and unseen a motive where there is none seen tends to exaltation

[3] Actions where the motives are seen are agriculture mer

---

[1] यदि स्वसदृशो ब्राह्मण एव विरोधी भवति तदात्मन एवोपवासादिना त्यागो ऽवश्यं कर्त्तव्यः यदि स्वस्य कुटुम्बस्य वा रक्षाप्रकारो न दृश्यते विरोधी च समो भवति तदा तस्यैव त्यागो वध इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] स्वापेक्षया विशिष्टे वेदाध्ययनादिना उत्कृष्टे विरोधिनि आत्मन एव त्यागो विधेयः प्राणसंशये सत्यप्यात्मानमेवाभिसंदधीत न तु ब्राह्मणं हन्यादित्यर्थः ॥

[3] दृष्टप्रयोजनानि कृषिवाणिज्यराजसेवादीनि अदृष्टप्रयोजनानि यागदानब्रह्मचर्यादीनि एतेषां कर्मणां मध्ये यत्र दृष्टं प्रयोजनं नोपलभ्यते तत्रादृष्टं प्रयोजनं कल्प्यं नीयमं तच्चाभ्युदयाय तत्त्वज्ञानाय वा अभ्युदयायेति चतुर्थी प्रथमार्थे तेन फलमभ्युदय इत्यर्थः अदृष्टं फलमपूर्वमथ तद् यदि योगजं तदाभ्युदय आत्मसाक्षात्कारः यदि याग दानादिजं तदाभ्युदयः स्वर्गः तत्रापि यथा दोग्धि पचतीत्यादिक्रिया सकर्मिका च

chandise service of the king, &c Actions where the motit es are unseen are sacrifice, charity, chastity, &c Among these actions where a visible motive is not observed, an invisible motive is to be supposed, and such a motive conduces to exaltation, or knowledge of the truth Or the dative case to exaltation may be employed in the sense of the nominative in which case the sense will be that exaltation is the result. An unseen result is a remote consequence If this be produced by asceticism, the exaltation is presentation of soul, if by sacrifice, almsgiving &c, the exaltation is paradise In this instance such actions as sacrificing, giving alms, continence &c, do not immediately bear fruit, as such actions as milking, cooking &c, have immediate results, and such actions as sowing ploughing &c after a while bear fruit, for there is no such proximate result observed Nor is gain &c, through being known as virtuous, the result For those who practise secret continence &c, do not design such results The result therefore is the remotely future paradise &c and this does not immediately suceed the action which rapi lly ceases to exist. It results therefore that there is in the interim a common site of the action and the fruit, viz requitative efficacy U

अभिषेचनोपवासब्रह्मचर्यगुरुकुलवासवानप्रस्थयज्ञदानप्रोक्षणदिङ्नक्षत्रमन्त्रकालनियमाश्चादृष्टाय ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Inaugurations fasting, continence, residence in the family of a spiritual guide, life in the forest, sacrifice, almsgiving, oblation, the cardinal points constellations, sacred texts, seasons, and religious observances, conduce to invisible result

---

पति कर्षतीत्यादिक्रिया च विलम्बभाविफला तथा जयति ददाति ब्रह्मचर्यं चरतीत्यादिक्रिया साक्षात् सद्य फलिका न भवति तादृशस्य फलस्यानुपलब्धेः न च धार्मिकतया ख्यात्यादिकमेव फलम् प्रच्छन्न ब्रह्मचर्यादि चरता तत्फलानुद्देशात् तस्माच्चिरभाविस्वर्गादिकमेव फलं तच्चाशुतरविनाशिन्या क्रियाया न साक्षादित्यान्तरालिक क्रियाफलयो समानाधिकरणमपूर्वं कल्पयति ॥

[1] Of these some of the actions of which the result is unseen, are pointed out These actions conduce to that is produce, unseen results Among these *inauguration is the sprinkling of kings*, fasting the abstinence of the Siva ratri, continence abstinence from sexual intercourse, residence in the house of a spiritual guide that of religious students for the purpose of studying the Veda, *living in the forest the actions of those who set out at the close of* life for the forest, sacrifice the Raja sûya &c, almsgiving at the beginning of the month Ashádha oblation of rice cattle &c, the cardinal points orientation of meals &c, constellations the obse *quial rites of the tenth lunar asterism Maghá &c.* sacred texts, the holy monosyllable Om the Gayatri &c., seasons the Chatur masya rites &c., religious observances purifications contentment, penance study, and meditation on the Deity By the word and, *are to be understood also those not here enumerated but which* are prescribed by revelation and tradition V

चातुराश्रम्यमुपधा अनुपधाश्च ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The duty of the four periods of *religious life* [has been declared] Fidelities and infidelities [are causes of merit and demerit]

[2] The duty of the four periods of religious life is the conduct prescribed in the e four stages viz those of the religious student, householder hermit and mendicant This has been already de clared —such are the words to be supplied Infidelities are defects

---

[1] तत्रादृष्टफलकानि कानिचित्कर्म्माणि प्रदर्शयति एतानि कर्म्माणि अदृष्टाय अदृष्टजनकानि तत्र अभिषेचनमभिषेको राज्ञाम् उपवास शिवरात्र्युपवासादि ब्रह्मचर्य्यमष्टविधमैथुनाद्विवर्ज्जनम गुरुकुलवासो ब्रह्मचारिणा वेदाध्ययनाद्यर्थं वानप्रस्थ वन्ये वनप्रस्थितानां पुरुषाकादिकर्म्म यज्ञो राजसूयादि दानमाषाढ्यादौ प्रोक्षणं व्रीहि पश्वादीनाम दिक्प्राङ्मुखभोजनादि नक्षत्र मघाश्राद्धादिमन्त्र प्रणवगायत्र्यादिकाल चातुर्मास्यव्रतादि नियमा शौचसन्तोषतप स्वाध्यायेश्वरप्रणिधानानि चकारादनुक्तानि श्रौतस्मार्त्तान्यपि ॥

[2] ब्रह्मचारिगृहिवानप्रस्थभिक्षुरूपेषु चतुर्षु आश्रमेषु विहित यत्कर्म्म तत चातुराश्रम्य पूर्वमुक्तमितिशेष उपधा भावदोषा अनुपधा भावदोषाभावश्च धर्म्म धर्म्मसाधनानीत्यर्थ ॥

of faith, fidelities non deficiencies of faith, efficient causes of merit and demerit V.

भावदोष उपधा ऽदोषो ऽनुपधा ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 A deficiency of faith is an infidelity, a non-deficiency a fidelity

[1] Deficiencies of faith, lust, anger, covetousness, infatuation, intoxication, envy &c, are expressed by the term infidelity, non-deficiencies of faith, freedom from negligence and sloth, tranquillity of mind &c, are to be understood by the term fidelity V

यदिष्टरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शं प्रोक्षितमभ्युक्षितञ्च तच्छुचि ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 That which is of prescribed colour, taste, smell and touch, the aspersed, and the sprinkled are pure

[2] That colour &c, which is enjoined by revelation and tradition is prescribed The substance to which such colour &c, belongs as such is pure Of these colour is prescribed in such texts as, He buys the soma for a cow, ruddy, one year old, with tawny eyes, He should take a white goat The aspersed is that which is sprinkled with water during the recitation of a sacred text, the sprinkled that which is sprinkled with water without a sacred text The word and implies that which is lawfully acquired This is such as is denoted by such precepts as that a Brahman should acquire wealth by performing sacrifices, by teaching, and by receiving presents U

अशुचीति शुचिप्रतिषेधः ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Impure denotes the negation of the pure

---

[1] कामक्रोधलोभमोहमदमात्सर्य्यादयो भावदोषा उपधाशब्दवाच्या श्रद्धाऽप्रमादानालस्यलन प्रसादादयो दोषा अनुपधाशब्दवाच्या इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] इष्टं श्रुत्या स्मृत्या च यद्रूपादिकं विहितं यस्य द्रव्यस्य तत्तथा तत्र रूपं अरुणया एकहायन्या पिङ्गाक्ष्या गवा सोमं क्रीणाति श्वेतं छागलमालभेतेत्यादौ प्रोक्षितं मन्त्रेणोदकसिक्तम् अभ्युक्षितं विनामन्त्रमुदकसिक्तं च काराच्चायतो लब्धं तच्च याजनाध्यापनप्रतिग्रहैर्ब्राह्मणो धनमर्जयेदित्यादिनियमविधिबोधितम् ॥

[1] The contrary of such substance as is pure is impure A substance of wrong colour, taste smell or touch one not aspersed or sprinkled or sprinkled with forbidden water, or unlawfully acquired as the property of a Brahman acquired by agriculture or merchandise, is impure U

अर्थान्तरञ्च ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 *And something else.*

[2] That which is vitiated by speech or by disposition even in *that which is of excellent colour taste smell or touch, or in that* which is aspersed or sprinkled or justly acquired is also impure U

अयतस्य शुचिभोजनादभ्युदयो न विद्यते नियमाभावात् विद्यते वा ऽर्थान्तरत्वाद्यमस्य ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 To the unrestrained there accrues no exaltation from eating what is pure inasmuch as there is an absence of religious observance, *or it accrues because restraint is something* else

[3] To the unrestrained means to one deficient in restraint or wanting in self control The eating of one void of the restraint denoted by such a rule as A man should eat after washing his hands and feet and rinsing his mouth restrained in speech When food is presented to him though pure he should twice rinse his

---

[1] यद्द्रव्यं शुचि तद्विपरीतमशुचीत्यर्थः अप्रशस्तरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शमप्रोक्षितमनभ्युक्षितं निषिद्धजलाभ्युक्षितं वा अन्यायागतम् कृषिवाणिज्यागतं ब्राह्मणद्रव्यमशुचीत्यर्थः ॥

[2] अप्रशस्तरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शमपि प्रोक्षितमभ्युक्षितं न्यायार्जितञ्च यत्तत्रापि वाग्दुष्टं भावदुष्टञ्च यत्तदप्यशुचीत्यर्थः ॥

[3] अयतस्य यमरहितस्यासंयतस्येति यावत् हस्तौ पादौ प्रक्षाल्याचम्य वाग्यतो भुञ्जीत भोक्ष्यमाणं प्रयतोऽपि द्विराचामेत् इत्यादिबोधितयमरहितस्य भोजनं नाभ्युदयाय किन्तु पापाय कुत एवमित्यत आह । नियमाभावात् नियमस्य सहकारिणोऽभावात् नियमे सति यत्तदात् विद्यते वा यथोक्तयमसाहित्येन भोजने भवत्येवाभ्युदयः कुत इत्यत आह । अर्थान्तरत्वाद् यमस्य भोजनादर्थान्तरं यतो यमः तथा च सहकारिकारणं विना न फलसिद्धिस्तस्मिन् सति फलसिद्धिरित्यर्थः ॥

mouth does not tend to exaltation, but to sin. It may be asked why, the answer accordingly is furnished. Inasmuch as there is an absence of religious observance in consequence of the non-existence of the religious observance, the secondary cause. That which takes place where the observance is performed is stated. Or it accrues,—exaltation accrues only in the case of eating with the accompaniment of the prescribed restraint. It may be asked why, hence it is stated that it is because restraint is something else, that is, is something else than eating. The sense therefore is that without the accessory cause there is no realisation of the result and that with it there is. U

असति चाभावात् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph. 9. For there is non-existence [of exaltation] where [the eating of pure food] does not exist.

[1] Though there be restraint where the eating of pure food is not there is non-existence of exaltation,—such is the completion of the ellipse. Restraint and eating are therefore both causes of merit. The word eating designates secondarily other actions. Restraint and religious observance are accessories also of sacrifice, almsgiving, ablutions, oblations and other acts prescribed by revelation and tradition. U

सुखाद्रागः ॥ १० ॥

Aph. 10. From pleasure arises desire.

[2] Restraint having been specified as an accessory with regard

---

[1] यमे सत्यपि शुचिभोजने सति अभावादभ्युदयस्येति शेषः तथा च यमो भोजनञ्च द्वयमेव पुण्यकारणमित्यर्थः भोजनमित्युपलक्षणं यागदानहोमादीनामपि श्रौतस्मार्तकर्मणां यमनियमौ सहकारिणौ ॥

[2] एवं धर्माधर्मप्रादुर्भावं प्रति यमसहकारिणमभिधाय दोषं सहकारिणमभिधातुं दोषनिदानमाह स्रक्चन्दनवनितादिविषयसम्पर्कजन्मनः सुखादुत्तरकालं तज्जातीये सुखसाधने यो रागः इच्छा सञ्जायते अहिकण्टकादिजन्मनो दुःखात् तत्र तत्साधने यो द्वेषः इत्यपि द्रष्टव्यम् रागद्वेषयोः प्रवर्तकत्वेन दोषा इत्यभिधानं तथा च गौतमीयं सूत्रम् प्रवर्तनालक्षणा दोषा इति ॥

to merit and demerit the origin of defects is stated, with the purpose of specifying defects as accessories Desire or wish arises from pleasure generated by attachment to garlands sandal wood, women and other objects of sens, or in the pleasures of those successive l inds or in the means of those pleasures It is al o to be considered that aversion arises from pain begotten by snakes, thorns &c, in those pains or in the means of those pains Desire, aversion, and infatuation in virtue of being incentives to activity, are called defects Accordingly the aphorism of Gautama, Defects have for their characteristic incitement to activity U

तन्मयत्वाच्च ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11 Also through that being engrained

[1] The words desire and aversion arise are to be supplied That which is engrained is a particular powerful reproduction engendered by use of objects of sense by the influence of which it is that the unhappy lover, who does not win his mistress sees his beloved in every object, and he who has been once bitten by a snake, in consequence of the forcible reproduction sees snakes everywhere It has therefore been said Habituation to an object is its luminous revelation external or internal U

अदृष्टाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Also through destiny

[2] The words desire and aversion arise are to be supplied Though destiny be a universal cause yet in relation to these it sometimes assumes the nature also of a special cause Such cases

---

[1] रागद्वेषौ भवत इतिशेष विषयाभ्यासजनितो दृढतर संस्कारविशेषस्तन्मयत्व यद्वशात कामातुरस्य कामिनीमलभमानस्य सर्व्वत्र कामिनीदर्शनम एवदा भुजभुजङ्गदष्टस्य तत्र दृढतरसंस्कारत सर्व्वत्र भुजङ्गदर्शनम तदुक्त तन्मयत्व तत्प्रकर्षो बाह्याभ्यन्तरतस्तथा इति ॥

[2] रागद्वेषाविति शेष यद्यप्यदृष्ट साधारणकारण तथापि क्वचित्तौ प्रति असाधारणतामप्यनुभजति यथा तज्जन्मानुभूतकामिनीमुखस्यापि यौवनोद्भेदे कामिनीराग अननुभूतभुजङ्गदशदु खानामपि भुजङ्गेषु द्वेष इत्याद्युह्येयम ॥

are to be inferred as the desire of a mistress at the commencement of youth, even in one who has not experienced in this birth the pleasures of love, the aversion towards snakes even in those who have not experienced pain from snake bites &c U

जातिविशेषाच्च ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Also through particularity of race

¹ Another accessory is stated Thus on the part of the human race there is desire towards rice &c on that of deer towards grass &c, on that of camels towards briers, &c In all these cases destiny which determines such and such a race is the cause; but race or particular birth is only a means Similarly the desire of pigeons &c for refuse So also the aversion of buffaloes towards a horse of dogs towards a jackal of ichneumons towards a snake &c is to be inferred U

इच्छाद्वेषपूर्विका धर्माधर्मप्रवृत्तिः ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 Activity in merit or demerit has for its antecedents desire and aversion

² Activity in a lawful action has desire for its condition, in an unlawful action injury &c activity has aversion for its condition Activity determined by desire in sacrifice &c begets merit activity determined by aversion in injury &c begets demerit These same desire and aversion cause the series of transmigrations

¹ सहकार्यान्तरमाह । तथाहि मनुष्यजातीयानामन्नादौ राग मृगजातीयानां तृणादौ करभजातीयानां कण्टकादौ तत्रापि तत्तज्जातिनिष्पादकमदृष्टमेव तन्त्र द्वारमात्रन्तु जातिर्जन्मविशेष एव पारावतादीनामुत्करे राग तथा महिषजातीयानां तुरङ्गद्वेष श्वा रमेयाणां शृगाले नकुलानां भुजङ्गमे इत्याद्यूह्यम् ॥

² विहिते कर्मणि रागनिबन्धना निषिद्धे कर्मणि हिंसादौ द्वेषनिबन्धना प्रवृत्ति रागनिबन्धना यागादौ प्रवृत्तिर्धर्मं प्रसूते द्वेषनिबन्धना हिंसादौ प्रवृत्तिरधर्मं तावेतौ रागद्वेषौ संसारमनुवर्तयत तथा च गौतमीय सूत्रम् प्रवृत्तिर्वाग्बुद्धिशरीरारम्भ इति वागारम्भो वाचिकी प्रवृत्ति सत्यं प्रियं हितमितिपुण्या असत्यमप्रियमहितमिति पापा बुद्धि बुध्यते ज्ञायतेऽनेनेति तेन बुध्यते तेन मानसी प्रवृत्तिर्भूतदयादि शारीरीप्रवृत्तिर्दान परिचरणादिका दशविधा पापा दशविधा पुण्या चेति ॥

Accordingly the aphorism of Gautama Activity is energy of word thought and body Verbal activity is energy of voice it is meritorious so far forth as it is true, kind, and useful, evil so far forth as untrue unkind, useless By thought intelligence, by which we think or know, is intended Sensorial activity therefore is compassion towards all creatures, &c Bodily activity is almsgiving ministration &c, evil in ten ways and good in ten ways U

ततः संयोगो विभागः ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 By these are conjunction and disjunction

[1] Existence in a future state is now declared to be the occasion of merit and demerit. By these—by merit and demerit—conjunction that is birth, is caused By conjunction is here intended connection with non previous pains of bodily organs. Disjunction is the disjunction of body and the internal sensory, characterised as death The meaning is therefore that this transitory world a series of births and deaths otherwise termed existence in a future state is caused by merit and demerit U

आत्मगुणकर्मसु मोक्षो व्याख्यातः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Emancipation is declared as dependent on the actions of the soul

[2] This it is which is the separation of body and soul When there exist the actions of the soul emancipation ensues The actions of the soul are as follows —hearing meditation the prac-

[1] इदानीं धर्माधर्मयोः प्रयोजनं प्रेत्यभावमाह। ताभ्यां धर्माधर्माभ्यां संयोगो जन्म अपूर्वाभिः शरीरेन्द्रियवेदनाभिः सम्बन्धः संयोग इहोच्यते विभागस्तु शरीरमनोविभागो मरणलक्षणः तथा चायं जन्ममरणप्रबन्धः संसारः प्रेत्यभावस्यापरपर्याय इति यदर्थो सत्ता ॥

[2] अयमेव शरीरविभागः आत्मकर्मसु सत्सु मोक्षो भवतीत्यर्थः तत्रात्मकर्माणि तावत् श्रवणं मननं योगाभ्यासो निदिध्यासनमासनं प्राणायामः शमदमसम्पत्तिः आत्मपरामर्शसाक्षात्कारो देहद्वारान्तरोपभोग्यपूर्व्वोत्पन्नधर्माधर्मपरिज्ञानं तद्भोगानुरूपनानादेहनिर्माणं तयोर्भोगेन प्रक्षयो रागद्वेषलक्षणदोषानुवर्त्तिमिथ्याज्ञानसमाधर्माधर्मयोरनुत्पादात् प्रवृत्तिरपाये जन्माभावो दुःखाभावलक्षणोऽपवर्गस्तत्र षट्पदार्थतत्त्वज्ञानमात्मकर्म ॥

tice of devotion, abstraction, a sitting posture, restraining the vital airs, of acquisition of quietism and self-subjugation, the presentation of one's own and others' souls, knowledge of merit and demerit previously acquired, whereof there must be fruition in other bodies and places, the formation of various bodies suitable to the fruition thereof, the destruction of merit and demerit by fruition, and emancipation characterised as removal of pain consequent on the cessation of birth, resulting from the cessation of activity in consequence of the non-production of further merit and demerit, by overcoming the mist of defects characterised as desire and aversion Of these the primary act of soul is knowledge of the real nature of the six categories U

SEVENTH BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON.

उक्ता गुणाः ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1. The qualities have been stated

[1] Desirous of investigating the qualities in the seventh book the author reminds us of their enunciation and definition. The meaning is that the qualities have been stated, that is, enunciated, and defined. V

पृथिव्यादिरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा द्रव्यानित्यत्वादनित्याश्च ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Also the colour, taste, smell, and touch of the earth &c, inasmuch as substances are non-eternal, are non-eternal

[2] The colour, taste, semll, and touch of earth; the colour touch, and taste of water, the colour and touch of light or fire; and

---

[1] सप्तमे गुणान् परीचिचिषुस्तदुद्देशलचणे स्मारयति । गुणा उक्ता उद्दिष्टा लचिताश्चेत्यर्थः ॥

[2] पृथिव्या रूपरसगंधस्पर्शाः, जलस्य रूपरसस्पर्शाः, तेजसो रूपस्पर्शौ, वायोः स्पर्शः, एतेषाम् नित्यायितानामनित्यत्वम् आश्रयनाशनाश्यत्वात् चकारादेकत्वैकपृथक्त्वपरिमितिगुरुत्वसांसिद्धिकद्रवत्वस्नेहानां संग्रहः, तेऽपि अनित्यगता अनित्या एवेत्यर्थः ॥

the touch of air,—these, inhering in the non eternal are non eternal, inasmuch as they cease to be on the cessation of the existence of their substrata The particle also implies unity, individual unity, extension gravity, natural fluidity, and viscidity These also are in the non eternal, non eternal V

एतेन नित्येषु नित्यत्वमुक्तम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 By this is declared their eternity in things eternal

[1] By this—by the affirmation that their non eternity is caused by the non eternity of their substrata, the eternity of colour &c in eternal substrata is declared that is virtually asserted being involved The reading adopted by the author of the Vritti is Non-eternity in things eternal In this opinion colour &c are non-eternal in things eternal, that is in atoms inasmuch as colour and the other qualities above mentioned are destructible by conjunction with fire. But it is to be considered that in this reading there is no congruity between the words by this and is declared V

अप्सु तेजसि वायौ च नित्या द्रव्यनित्यत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 They are eternal in water light, and air, inasmuch as the substances are eternal

[2] It may be objected, Why whereas colour and the other qualities residing in terrene atoms are destructible by conjunction with fire is it universally stated that they are eternal in things eternal? The things eternal are therefore characterised. The sense is that colour and the other qualities are not eternal when existing in eternal earth but are stated in the preceding aphorism to be eternal only when residing in eternal water light and air V

[1] एतेन आश्रयानित्यत्वहेतुकानित्यत्वकथनेन नित्येषु आश्रयेषु रूपादीनां नित्यत्वमुक्तमुक्तप्रायमर्थापत्त्यादित्यर्थः नित्येष्वनित्यत्वमिति वृत्तिकारसम्मतः पाठः, तन्मते नित्येषु पार्थिवपरमाणुषु रूपादीनामनित्यत्वमग्निसंयोगनाश्यत्वादित्यर्थः, किन्तु तादृशपाठे एतेनेति उक्तमिति च सङ्गतं न भवतीति ध्येयम् ॥

[2] ननु पार्थिवपरमाणुगतानां रूपादीनामग्निसंयोगनाश्यत्वात् कथं नित्येष्विति सामान्यत उक्तमतो नित्यानि विशेषयति । न खलु नित्यपृथिवीगता रूपादयो नित्याः किन्तु नित्यजलतेजोवायुगतास्त एव नित्याः पूर्वसूत्रे उक्ता इत्यर्थः ॥

M

अनित्येष्वनित्या द्रव्यानित्यत्वात् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 In things non eternal they are non eternal because the substances are non eternal

[1] It may be asked whether qualities other than colour &c existing in things non eternal are eternal in which case conjunction &c would be eternal It is therefore stated that all qualities which reside in things non eternal are non eternal in consequence of the non eternity of their substratum and that consequently there are no eternal qualities in things non eternal U

कारणगुणपूर्व्वकाः पृथिव्याः पाकजाः ॥ ६ ॥

Aph. 6 [Colour taste smell and touch] produced by combustion in earth have for their antecedents the qualities of their causes

[2] It is implied that the colour taste smell and touch residing

---

[1] ननु रूपादिभिन्ना अनित्यगता गुणाः किं नित्यास्तथा च संयोगादिकमपि नित्यं स्यादित्यत आह । अनित्येषु ये गुणा वर्तन्ते ते सर्वे एवानित्या आश्रयानित्यत्वात् तथा चानित्येषु नित्या गुणा न सन्त्यर्थः ॥

[2] रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शाः अवयविगता इति विवरणीयं कारणगुणपूर्व्वकाः स्वाश्रयस्य यानि कारणानि अवयवा इति यावत् तत्र ये गुणाः स्वसजातीयगुणाः तेभ्यः प्रादुर्भवन्तीत्यर्थः तथा चावयविवृत्तिरूपरसगन्धस्पर्शानामसमवायिकारणानि अवयवगता रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शास्तथा समवायिकारणप्रत्यासत्त्यन्तु स्वसमवायसम्बन्धेनेति बोध्यम् ननु श्यामघटादौ बलवदग्निसंयोगानन्तरं कथं रक्ताद्युत्पत्तिरित्यत उक्तं पृथिव्याः पाकजाश्चेति अपीति शेषः तथा च पार्थिवा रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शाः पाकजा अपि पाकस्तु रूपादिपरावृत्तिफलक विजातीयतेजःसंयोगः सोऽपि रूपादेरसमवायिकारणं भवति तत्र च परमाणावेव पाकाद्रूपादिपरावृत्तिर्नावयविनीति पीलुपाकवादिनः तन्मते विजातीयाग्निसंयोगादारम्भकसंयोगनाशेन द्व्यणुकपर्य्यन्तावयविनाशे सति परमाणौ रक्ताद्युत्पत्तिस्ततो विजातीयाग्निसंयोगादारम्भकसंयोगानुगुणक्रियाद्युत्पत्त्यारम्भकसंयोगादिप्रक्रमेण पुनर्द्व्यणुकादिमहावयविपर्य्यन्तानामुत्पत्तिर्भवतीति। पिठरपाकवादिनस्तु अवयविनां सच्छिद्रतया विजातीयाग्निसंयोगात् तत्रापि रूपादिपरावृत्तिर्भवति न तु तत्रावयविनाशः प्रत्यभिज्ञाविरोधादित्याहुः । अत्र च पाकप्रक्रिया ग्रन्थगौरवभिया परित्यक्ता ऽन्यत्रानुसन्धेया । ये तु नीलरूपादिव्यक्तय एकैका एव नित्या इत्याहुस्तन्मते नीलरूपं नष्टं श्यामरूपमुत्पन्नमित्यादिप्रतीतिव्यवहारयोरनुपपत्तिः समवायसम्बन्धस्य नित्यतया तद्विषयतया रूपाद्यसम्भवात् अन्यथा घटादीनामपि नित्यत्वमेकत्वञ्चापद्येत घटस्य रूपमिति भेदप्रत्ययात् गुणगुणिनोर्नाभेदः नीलपीतादिनानातन्त्वाद्यारब्धे पटादौ चित्ररूपमेव जायते

in wholes, have for their antecedents the qualities of their cause, that is that they become manifest from the homogeneous qualities which are attributes of the parts, which are the cause of their own substratum It is thus to be understood that the presentation of colour, taste, smell and touch residing in the parts which are the non coinherent causes of colour, taste smell, and touch, existing in the wholes, is by the connection of co inhesion with the coinherent In anticipation of the question how in a dark water pot &c after powerful conjunction with fire there is production of red colour &c., it is stated that in earth those qualities produced by burning also—for the word also is to be supplied—colour, taste smell, and touch in earth even when produced by burning have for their antecedents the qualities of their causes Burning is an extraordinary conjunction with fire resulting in change of colour, &c This also is a non coinherent cause of colour &c On this subject those who maintain the combustion of atoms hold that it is *in the atom that the change of colour &c consequent on combustion takes place* and not in the whole According to their doctrine the red colour &c is produced in the atom after the dissolution of the whole into binary atomic *aggregates* by *destruction of the* originative conjunction consequent upon an extraordinary conjunction with fire, and after this ensues again production beginning with binary aggregates and terminating in the whole possessed of magnitude in the progressive order of originative conjunction &c caused by the production of action &c conformable to originative conjunction in consequence of an extraordinary conjunction with fire Those who maintain the combustion of wholes such as the pot teach that, the wholes being porous it is in them that the

---

तादृशपटस्य नीलरूपत्वे तच्चाक्षुषानुपपत्तेः नव्यास्तु तत्र पटे तत्तदवयवावच्छेदेन नानैव
रूपाणि भवन्ति । अतएव "लोहितो यस्तु वर्णेन मुखे पुच्छे च पाण्डुरः । श्वेतः खुर
विषाणाभ्यां स नीलो वृष उच्यते" ॥ इत्यादिकं सङ्गच्छते इत्याहुः रसगन्धयोस्तु न
चित्रत्वं नानारसादिमदवयवारब्धानामवयविनां नीरसत्वादिस्वीकारेऽपि क्षत्यभावात्
चित्रस्पर्शस्तु रूपस्थलीययुक्त्या स्वीकरणीय एवेति सङ्क्षेपः ॥

change of colour &c. takes place in consequence of conjunction with the particular kind of fire, and that there is in this case no destruction of the wholes, for this would be contrary to observation. The order of combustion is here omitted to avoid voluminous prolixity, and may be sought elsewhere According to the doctrine of those who teach that particular blue colours &c are only individually eternal, the cognition and expression that blue colour has ceased to exist and dark colour has been produced is improper, inasmuch as connection by co inherence is eternal and the production of such a cognition and expression with connection by co inhesion as its object, is impossible Else, were it possible, the eternity and unity of water pots &c would follow There being a cognition of difference in the nature of the colour of a water-pot, there cannot but be a difference in the attribute and then in the subject of the attribute In a piece of cloth &c originating in various threads &c of blue yellow, and other colours, there is produced a composite colour for were such cloth colourless &c, its visual presentation would be impossible In conformity with this, they say, is the verse That is said to be a blue ox which is ruddy in colour in the face yellowish in the tail and white in the horns and hoofs Taste and smell are never composite, there being no harm if it be but allowed that wholes originated by parts possessing various tastes &c are tasteless &c. A composite touch must be allowed according to the analogy of colour V

एकद्रव्यत्वात् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Because there is only one substance

[1] In reply to the objection How can the qualities of the cause as not existing in the effect be productive of the qualities of the

[1] ननु कारणगुणानां कार्येऽसत्त्वात् कथं कार्यगुणजनकत्वं वैयधिकरण्यादित्यत आह । एकं द्रव्यमधिकरणं यस्य तत्त्वात् सामानाधिकरण्यादित्यर्थः तथा च कारणगुणानां साक्षात् समवायसम्बन्धेन कार्ये असत्त्वेऽपि स्वसमवायिसमवायरूपसामानाधिकरण्यसम्बन्धेन कार्ये सत्त्वात्तद्गुणजनकत्वं नानुपपन्नमिति भावः ॥

effect there being a difference of substratum? it is stated that it is because there exists that whereof there is one substance as the substratum, that is because there is a common substratum Notwithstanding therefore, that the qualities of the cause do not exist in the relation of immediate co inherence in the effect yet inasmuch as in the relation of community of substratum characterised as co-inherence with the co-inherent, they do exist in the effect, the production by them of the qualities of the effect is not impossible. V

अणोर्महतश्चोपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी नित्ये व्याख्याते ॥ ८ ॥

Aph. 8 The perception and non perception of the atomic and of that which has magnitude have been explained to be constant.

[1] The word eternal or constant refers as to a section to that which *contains it to the fourth book which treats of eternity* The respective application of the words perception and non-percep-

---

[1] नित्ये इति विषयेण विषयि नित्यत्वप्रतिपादकं चतुर्थाध्यायमुपलक्षयति उपलब्ध्यनुपलब्धी इति यथायोगमन्वयः 'येन यस्याभिसम्बन्धो दूरस्थस्यापि तस्य सः' इतिन्यायेन तथा चाणोरनुपलब्धिरिति लभ्यते तदेव स्फुटं। नील कलस इति प्रत्यक्षप्रत्यये यथा नील रूप विषयस्तथा परिमाणमपि तन च परिमाणेन परमाणुपर्यन्त परिमाणमुच्यते द्रव्यत्वाच्च 'कञ्च द्रव्यप्रत्यक्षतायां रूपवत परिमाणमपि कारण नहि महत्त्वमन्तरेण द्रव्य प्रत्यक्ष भवति तथा च द्रव्यप्रत्यक्षरूपत्वेन स्वयञ्च प्रत्यक्षतया परिमाण गुणोऽस्तीति निश्चीयते यदि हि घटादिस्वरूप परिमाण स्यात तदा महदानयेत्युक्ते घटमात्रमानयेत् तथा च प्रतीतिसम्प्रतिपत्ती विरुध्येयाताम एव घटपदात परिमाण प्रतीयेत परिमाणपदाद्वा घट इति मानव्यवहारासाधारणकारणत्व द्रव्यसाक्षात्कारणविषयनिष्ठसामान्यगुणत्व वा महत्त्व मानव्यवहारो हस्तवितस्त्यादिव्यवहारो न तु पलसङ्ख्यादिव्यवहारः तच्च परिमाणञ्चतुर्विध महत्त्वमणुत्व दीर्घत्व ह्रस्वत्वञ्च तत्र परममहत्त्वपरमदीर्घत्वे विभुचतुष्टयवर्तिनी परमाणुत्वपरमह्रस्वत्वे परमाणुवर्तिनी अवान्तराणुत्वावान्तरह्रस्वत्वे द्व्यणुकवर्तिनी त्र्यसरेणुमारभ्य महावयविपर्यन्त महावयवत्वदीर्घत्वे एवञ्च सर्वाण्यपि द्रव्याणि परिमाणद्वयवन्ति बिल्वामलकादावणुत्वव्यवहारः समिदिक्षुदण्डादिषु च ह्रस्वत्वव्यवहारो भाक्तः भक्तिश्चात्र प्रकर्षभावाभावः आमलके यः प्रकर्षभावस्तस्याभावः कुवले बिल्वे यः प्रकर्षभावस्तस्याभाव आमलके स च गौणमुख्योभयभागित्वाद भक्तिपदवाच्यः दीर्घत्वह्रस्वत्वे नित्ये न वर्तेते इत्येके परिमाणं सूत्र ते न भवत इत्यपरे, महत्सु दीर्घमानीयतामितिवत महत्सु वर्तुल त्रिकोणञ्चानीयतामिति निर्धारणबलाद्वर्तुलत्वादीनाम प्यापत्तेरिति सम्प्रदायपात ॥

tion is according to the rule That which is connected with another, is connected with the more remote Non perception of the atomic is thus obtained In the presentative cognition therefore, determined as a large blue water-pot, the extension is just as much an object as the blue colour, and by means of this, extension terminating in the atomic as a minimum is inferred, as also from substantiality Moreover of the perceptibility of substance the cause is coloured extension, for without magnitude substance cannot be perceived Accordingly it is decided that, as being a cause of perceptibility of substance, and as being of itself perceptible, extension is a quality For were the form of a water pot &c., its extension, a man would bring a water-pot, when he was told to bring the great, and thus there would be a contradiction in the order and the apprehension of it, *and likewise by the term water pot, extension would be conveyed,* or by the term extension a water pot The notion of magnitude is that of a particular cause of the usage of measurement or that of a universal quality existing in objects and the cause of the presentation of substance The usage of measurement is the usage of cubits spans &c not the usage of weights, numbers &c This extension is of four kinds, the great, the small the long and the short Of these, infinite greatness and infinite length exist in the four pervading substances absolute smallness and absolute shortness exist in atoms Intermediate smallness and intermediate shortness exist in binary atomic aggregates Greatness and length reside in substances, from tertiary atomic aggregates upwards to composite wholes In this manner all substances whatever possess two extensions or dimensions The notion of smallness in a vilva or amalaka fruit and of shortness in fuel sugar canes &c, is relative The relativity in this case is the existence or non existence of greater size There is non existence in a jujube of the greater size, of which there is existence in an emblic myrobalan There does not exist in an emblic myrobalan the greater size which exists in a vilva fruit. This as containing as parts both the primary and

secondary magnitudes, is described by the term relative magnitude U

कारणबहुत्वाच्च ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Also in consequence of a plurality of causes, extension is produced

[1] The particle also implies the addition of magnitude and coalescence Extension is produced is the ellipse to be supplied in the aphorism Among these plurality of causes alone produces greatness and length in a tertiary aggregate since greatness and accretion do not exist in their cause The plurality is derived from the relative cognition of the Deity The influence of particular destiny determines a plurality of objects in the divine cognition Similarly duality existing in two atoms is productive of extension in a binary atomic aggregate In a piece of cloth originated by two threads not coalescent it is magnitude alone which is the non-coinherent cause inasmuch as plurality and coalescence do not there exist But where a ball of cotton is originated by two balls of cotton in this case coalescence is the cause for there is here observed an increase of extension and there is no plurality, and magnitude even though it existed could not be an occasion of increase of extension Such being the case even were magnitude here a cause there would be no failure in the argument Hence it has been said By two by one or by all Coalescence is an

[1] चकारो महत्त्वप्रचयौ समुच्चिनोति परिमाणमुत्पद्यते इति सूत्रशेष तत्र कारण बहुत्व केवल त्र्यणुके महत्त्वदीर्घत्वे जनयतो महत्त्वप्रचययोस्तत्कारणेऽभावात तच्च बहुत्वमीश्वरापेक्षाबुद्धिजन्य तद्बुद्धेरनेकविषयत्वेऽप्यदृष्टविशेषोपग्रहो नियामक एव परमाणुद्वयगत द्वित्व द्व्यणुके परिमाणोत्पादक वक्ष्यते द्वाभ्या तन्तुभ्यामप्रचिताभ्यामारब्धे पटे केवल महत्त्वमसमवायिकारण बहुत्वप्रचययोस्तत्राभावात यत्र च द्वाभ्या तूलकपिण्डाभ्या तूलकपिण्डारम्भस्तत्र परिमाणोत्कर्षदर्शनात प्रचय कारण बहुत्वस्याभावात महत्त्वस्य सत्त्वेऽपि परिमाणोत्कर्षप्रत्यप्रयोजकत्वात एवञ्च सति यदि महत्त्व तत्र कारण तदा न दोष तदुक्त द्वाभ्यामेकेन सर्वैर्वा इति । प्रचयश्च आरम्भक संयोग सच स्वाभिमुखकिञ्चिदवयवासंयुक्तत्वे सति स्वाभिमुखकिञ्चिदवयवसंयोगलक्षण सचावयवसंयोग स्वावयवप्रशिथिलसंयोगापेक्ष परिमाणजनक गुणकर्मारम्भे सापेक्षइतिवचनात ॥

originative conjunction, and is defined as conjunction in an object of some of its constituent parts towards itself, in which object some of the constituent parts are non conjunct towards itself; for it is said that this conjunction of constituent parts involves a lax conjunction of its own portions, is productive of extension, and is involved in the origination of qualities and actions U.

अतो विपरीतमणु ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 The contrary of this is the minute

[1] That which is the contrary of this, that is of great extension established by perception, is minute extension The contrariety arises from imperceptibility, and contrariety of causes; for the causes of magnitude are magnitude, plurality, and coalescence, and the cause of minuteness is duality produced by the relative conception of the Deity residing in the cause By this is also to be understood shortness the contrary of length, and in this case also the contrariety is as aforesaid U

अणु महदिति तस्मिन् विशेषभावात् विशेषाभावाच्च ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 The notions greater and smaller [arise] in this conception [of a relatively great and a relatively small object] from the existence of particularity, and from the non-existence of particularity.

[2] The word *iti* refers to the usage There is, then, a practical

---

[1] अतः प्रत्यक्षसिद्धान्महतः परिमाणाद्विपरीतं तदणुपरिमाणमित्यर्थः। वैपरीत्यञ्चाप्रत्यक्षत्वात कारणवैपरीत्याच्च महत्त्वे हि महत्त्वबहुत्वप्रचयानां कारणत्वम् अणुत्वे च कारणगतस्य द्वित्वस्येश्वरापेक्षाबुद्धिजन्यस्य कारणत्वम्, एतेन दीर्घत्वविपरीतं ह्रस्वत्वमित्यपि द्रष्टव्यम, वैपरीत्यञ्चात्रापि पूर्ववत् ॥

[2] इतिशब्दो व्यवहारपरतां दर्शयति तेन बिल्वापेक्षया कुवलमणु कुवलापेक्षयामलकं महत् आमलकापेक्षया बिल्वं महदिति तावद्व्यवहारोऽस्ति तत्र महदिति तेषु व्यवहारो मुख्यः, कुत एवमतआह। विशेषभावामहत्त्वविशेषस्यैव तरतमादिभावेन भावात, अणुव्यवहारस्तु तेषु भाक्त कुत एवमत आह। विशेषस्य तत्राभावात् अणुत्वविशेषस्य तत्राभावात् अणुत्व हि कार्यं द्व्यणुकमात्रवृत्ति, नित्यं परमाणुवृत्ति कुवलादौ तदभावात् यद्वा विशेषस्य महत्त्वकारणसंख्यावयवबहुत्वमहत्त्वप्रचयानां कुवलाद्यवयवेषु भावात् सद्भावात् विशेषाभावात् विशेषस्य अणुत्वकारणस्य महत्त्वासमानाधिकरणद्वित्वस्य कुवलाद्यवयवेष्वभावादसद्भावादित्यर्थः ॥

assurance that a jujube is small in relation to a bel-fruit, an emblic myrobalan great in relation to a jujube, and a bel-fruit great in relation to an emblic myrobalan Among these the principal notion is that of greatness. The reason of this is stated to be that there exists particularity, that is, that there exists particular magnitude, because there is a relation of more and less But among these the notion of smallness is relative The reason of this is said to be the non-existence of particularity, that is the non-existence there is of particular smallness For minuteness as a product resides only in binary atomic aggregates, and as eternal abides only in the ultimate particles. But this does not exist in a jujube, &c. In other words, it is because there exist in the particles of the jujube &c plurality, magnitude and coalescence of constituent elements, which are a particular cause of magnitude, and because there does not exist in the jujube &c duality not having a common substratum with magnitude, which duality is the cause of smallness U.

एककालत्वात् ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Because the time is one

[1] The greatness and smallness are both experienced at one time, and these greatness and smallness being contrary to one another cannot exist together in one substratum Therefore, inasmuch as there exists a cause of greatness, the conception of magnitude is in this instance primary and the notion and usage with regard to smallness are derivative or relative only U

दृष्टान्ताच्च ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Also because of the example

[2] It is seen likewise that in the natural order of things there

---

[1] महत्त्वमणुत्वञ्च द्वयमप्येकस्मिन् काले ऽनुभूयेते, ते च महत्त्वाणुत्वे परस्परविरोधिनो नैकत्राश्रये सह सम्भवतः, अतो महत्त्वकारणसद्भावान्महत्त्वप्रत्ययस्तत्र मुख्योऽणुत्वप्रत्ययप्रयोगौ च भाक्तावित्यर्थः ॥

[2] दृश्यते तथा वस्तुगत्या महत्स्वेव कुवलामलकबिल्वेषु न्यूनन्यूनतरन्यूनतमव्यवहारेण भवितव्यमित्यर्थः यथा वस्तुगत्या शुक्लेष्वेव पटशङ्खस्फाटिकादिषु शुक्लशुक्लतरशुक्लतमव्यवहारः ॥

must be a practical conception of a great, greater, and greatest, in the jujube, emblic myrobalan, and bel-fruits which possess magnitude, just as in the course of things there is a conventional notion of white whiter, and whitest, in a piece of cloth, a conch shell crystal &c, which are white U

अणुत्वमहत्त्वयोरणुत्वमहत्त्वाभावः कर्मगुणैर्व्याख्यातः ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 The non-existence of greatness and smallness in greatness and smallness, is explained by greatness and smallness

[1] It may be objected that in virtue of the practical notion of small and great extension, it is known that in magnitude as an extension there exists magnitude, and in smallness as an extension there exists smallness How then can these exist in substance alone, or how does not the contradiction emerge of the existence of quality in quality? In answer to this it is stated that as quality and action do not possess quality and action, so also greatness and smallness do not possess greatness and smallness, and that such a conventional notion is to be regarded as tropical U

कर्मभिः कर्माणि गुणैश्च गुणा व्याख्याताः ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 Actions are explained to be [void] of actions, and qualities of qualities

[2] It may be urged that as qualities are possessed of qualities —and how else could there be such conventional notions as a loud sound, one sound twenty four qualities &c?—and as actions are

[1] नन्वणुमहत्परिमाणव्यवहारबलान्महत्त्वेऽपि परिमाणे महत्त्वमणुत्वे चाणुत्वमस्तीति ज्ञायते तत कथं द्रव्यमात्रवृत्तित्वमनयोः कथं वा गुणे गुणवृत्तित्वविरोधो नापद्यत इत्यत आह। यथा गुणकर्मणी नाणुत्वमहत्त्ववती तथा अणुत्वमहत्त्वे अपि नाणुत्वमहत्त्ववती इत्यर्थः प्रयोगश्च भाक्तो द्रष्टव्यः ॥

[2] ननु यथा गुणा गुणवन्तः कथमन्यथा महान् शब्दः द्वौ शब्दौ एकः शब्दः चतुर्विंशतिर्गुणा इत्यादिव्यवहारः, कर्माण्यपि च कर्मवन्ति प्रतीयन्ते कथमन्यथा शीघ्रं गच्छति द्रुतं गच्छतीति व्यवहारः तथा चाणुत्वमहत्त्वे अपि न तद्वती स्यातामित्यत आह। कर्मभिः कर्माणि न तद्वन्ति गुणैश्च गुणा न तद्वन्तस्तथाऽणुत्वमहत्त्वे अपि न तद्वती, व्यवहारस्तु सर्वत्र भाक्त इत्यर्थः ॥

possessed of actions—and how else could there be such cognitions as, *It goes quickly*, *It goes rapidly*?—so in like manner greatness and smallness* must also be possessed of greatness and smallness In answer to this it is stated that actions are not possessed of actions nor are qualities possessed of qualities and that in like manner greatness and smallness are not possessed of greatness and smallness but the conventional notion *is in all these cases tropical* U

अणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्यां कर्मगुणाश्च व्याख्याताः ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16 Actions moreover and qualities are explained to be [void] of smallness and greatness

[1] It may be urged that in virtue of such conventional notions as small actions great actions small qualities great qualities the *extension greatness and smallness must be concluded to exist in* action and quality It is therefore stated that as the extensions greatness and smallness do not exist in the extensions greatness and smallness, in like manner neither of those extensions exists in action or in qualities, and that the aforesaid conventional notions have as their objects increase and diminution V

एतेन दीर्घत्वह्रस्वत्वे व्याख्याते ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17 By this length and shortness are explained

[2] It is stated that shortness and length are similar to smallness and greatness As smallness and greatness are proved to exist by the conventional notions of great and small so shortness and length are proved to exist by the conventional notions of long and short In like manner also the notion and convention that one thing is

---

[1] नन्वणूनि कर्माणि महान्ति कर्माणि अणवो गुणा महान्तो गुणा इत्यादिव्यवहारदर्शनात् कर्मणि गुणे च अणुत्वमहत्त्वपरिमाणं सत्त्वमित्यत आह । यथा अणुत्वमहत्त्वपरिमाणयोर्नाणुत्वमहत्त्वपरिमाणं तथा कर्मणि गुणेषु च न तदुभयम् उक्तव्यवहारश्चापकर्षोत्कर्षविषयक एवेति ॥

[2] ह्रस्वत्वदीर्घत्वयोरप्यणुत्वमहत्त्वतुल्यतेत्याह । यथा अणु महदितिव्यवहारसिद्धे अणुत्वमहत्त्वे तथा ह्रस्वं दीर्घमितिव्यवहारसिद्धे ह्रस्वत्वदीर्घत्वे एवमिदमस्माद् ह्रस्वमिदमस्माद्दीर्घमित्यादिप्रत्ययव्यवहारावप्यपकर्षोत्कर्षविषयकावित्यर्थः ॥

shorter or is longer than another, have for their object increase and diminution V

अनित्ये ऽनित्यम् ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 In the non-eternal [extension] is non-eternal

[1] Extension is non-eternal in the non eternal. It is in consequence of the destruction of its substratum that it ceases to exist. It is not to be maintained that in a water pot and the like where there is an increase or diminution by two, three or more atoms there is another extension recognised by perception on the ground that there is in this case no destruction of the water pot &c inasmuch as there exists in regard to it the recognition that it is the same water pot For in the case of a diminution or increase of the atoms there is necessarily a destruction commencing in the tertiary atomic aggregates and terminating in the composite wholes there being necessarily a destruction of the binary aggregates, for the sum of destroying causes fails not in obtaining its effect through any difficulty with regard to the recognition In the case of an increase in the body &c there is necessarily a destruction of the composite whole in consequence of the necessity of the destruction of the non-coinherent cause Nor can it be urged Where there is not destruction of a piece of cloth &c how can there be an addition of extension resulting from conjunction with other threads? For in this instance

[1] परिमाणमनित्ये अनित्यमाश्रयविनाशादेव तन्नश्यतीत्यर्थः नच घटादौ त्रिचतुरादिपरमाणुविश्लेषे तदुपचये वा परिमाणान्तरं प्रत्यक्षसिद्धं स एवायं घट इत्यादिप्रत्यभिज्ञायास्तत्र सत्त्वेन घटादेस्तत्राविनाशादिति वाच्यं परमाणुविश्लेषे तदुपचये वा द्व्यणुकनाशस्यावश्यकत्वेन त्रसरेण्वाद्यन्त्यावयविपर्य्यन्तनाशस्याप्यावश्यकत्वात् नहि विनाशकसामग्री प्रत्यभिज्ञाभिया कार्य्यं नार्जयिष्यति शरीरादावप्यवयवोपचयेऽसमवायिकारणनाशस्यावश्यकत्वादवयविनाश आवश्यकः नच पटाविनाशेऽपि तन्त्वन्तरसंयोगात् कथं परिमाणाधिक्यमिति वाच्यं तत्रापि वेमाद्यभिघातेनासमवायिकारणतन्तुसंयोगनाशादेव पटनाशस्यावश्यकत्वात् किञ्च तन्त्वन्तरस्य तत्पटावयवत्वे पूर्व्वं तत्पट एव न स्यात् तत्तन्तुरूपकारणाभावात् तत्तन्तोरवयवत्वाभावे च न तेन परिमाणाधिक्यं सयवद्द्रव्यान्तरवत् तस्मात्तत्र तन्त्वान्तरसंयोग सति पूर्व्वपटनाशात्पटान्तरोत्पत्तिरित्यवश्यं स्वीकार्य्यम अवयविन प्रत्यभिज्ञानन्तु साजात्येन सैवेयं दीपकलिकेत्यादिवत । नच पूर्व्वतन्तव एव तन्त्वन्तरसहकारात् पूर्व्वपटे सत्येव पटान्तरमारभन्त इति वाच्य मूर्त्तयोः समानदेशताविरोधादिति सङ्क्षेपः ॥

there must needs be destruction of the piece of cloth resulting from the destruction of the conjunction of the threads, which conjunction is the non-coinherent cause, such destruction being caused by the striking of the loom, &c Moreover if that other thread were a portion of that cloth, the cloth of which it is the thread would not previously exist, since the thread which is its cause would not exist. But if that thread be not a part, there can be thereby no addition to its extension, as is the case with other conjunct substances It must, therefore, necessarily be admitted that in this case, when conjunction with another thread takes place there results production of another piece of cloth from destruction of the former piece of cloth The recognition of the composite whole is caused by the homogeneity of the former and latter wholes, as in the recognition of the continuous identity of the flame of a lamp Nor is it to be maintained that the former threads through the subsidiary agency of the other threads, originate a new piece of cloth during the existence of the former piece of cloth *for it would involve the contradiction of* two substances at the same time occupying the same space V

नित्ये नित्यम् ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 In the eternal it is eternal

[1] The extension which exists in things eternal, that is in ether &c and in atoms is eternal, for there is nothing to destroy it U

नित्यं परिमण्डलम् ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 Atomic extension is eternal

[2] The word *pai imandala* technically designates atomic extension, and an atom characterised by such extension An atom, that is a substance consisting of an ultimate particle characterised by *atomic extension, is eternal there is therefore no scarcity of eternal*

---

[1] नित्येष्वाकाशादिषु परमाणुषु च यत् परिमाणं तन्नित्यं विनाशकाभावात् ॥

[2] परिमण्डलशब्दो परमाणुपरिमाणं तद्विशिष्टं परिमाणञ्च परिभाषया प्रतिपादयति परिमण्डलं पारिमाण्डल्यपरिमाणविशिष्टं परमाणुरूपं द्रव्यं नित्यमिति न नित्यद्रव्यस्य दुर्भिक्षतेत्यर्थः । तस्य नित्यत्वञ्च प्रागेव प्रतिपादितम् ॥

substance The eternity thereof has also previously been declared V

अविद्या च विद्यालिङ्गम् ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 Ignorance, moreover, is an indication of knowledge

[1] It may be asked why should we admit substance in the form of atoms, since it cannot be perceived, and may be maintained that only such substance as is cognised by perception, such as tertiary atomic aggregates &c, is to be admitted To this the reply is furnished Ignorance, the absence of certain knowledge, that is such cognition as that earth is eternal or that water is eternal, having a composite whole as its object, is a mark or indication of the existence of the science or certain knowledge, the object of which is atomic that earth is eternal, inasmuch as certain knowledge has always for its antecedent the absence of certain knowledge, for such an error as that earth is eternal cannot arise in one that has no notion of eternity This mode of proving accidentally but really the existence of atoms, which has been formerly described, merits attention V

विभवान्महानाकाशस्तथा चात्मा ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 Ether, in consequence of its universal pervasion, is infinitely great, and so likewise is soul

[2] Ether as pervading all things in consequence of conjunction

---

[1] ननु परमाणुरूपं द्रव्यं कथमङ्गीकर्तव्यं तस्याप्रत्यक्षत्वात् त्रसरेण्वादिकन्तु प्रत्यक्षसिद्धं यद् द्रव्यं तदेवाङ्गीकरणीयमित्यत आह । अविद्या अप्रमा पृथिवी नित्या जलं नित्यमित्यादिप्रतीतिरवयविविषयिणी विद्यायाः परमाणुविषयिण्याः पृथिवी नित्येति प्रमाया लिङ्गम् सर्व्वत्र प्रमाया अप्रमापूर्व्वकत्वात् नहि कुत्रापि नित्यत्वमजानतः पृथिवी नित्येति भ्रमो भवितुमर्हति एतच्चापाततः वस्तुतः परमाणुसिद्धिप्रकारः प्राक् प्रदर्शित एवादरणीय ॥

[2] विभवात् सर्व्वमूर्त्तसंयोगादाकाशो महान् परममहत्परिमाणवान् तच्च परिमाणं नित्यमाकाशस्य नित्यत्वात् आकाशस्य सर्व्वमूर्त्तसंयोगाभावे नानादेशावच्छेदेन शब्दोत्पत्त्यसम्भवात् तत्तद्देशाकाशसंयोगस्य तत्तच्छब्दासमवायिकारणत्वात् एवमात्मापि नित्यपरममहत्परिमाणवान् विभवात् अदृष्टवदात्मसंयोगस्य सर्गाद्यकालीनपरमाणुकर्म्महेतुत्वादात्मवैभवमप्यावश्यकम् ॥

with all finite things is infinitely great or possesses infinitely great extension This extension is eternal since ether is eternal Did there not exist in ether conjunction with all matter the production of sound limited to various places would be impossible for conjunction with ether in respective places is the non coinherent cause of respective sounds In like manner soul also is possessed of eternal and infinitely great extension being all pervasive The universal pervasion of soul is proved inasmuch as conjunction with soul influenced *by destiny is the cause of action in the atoms at the time of* creation V

तदभावादणु मनः ॥ २३ ॥

Aph 23 In consequence of non existence of that [universal pervasion] the internal organ is absolutely small

[1] It may be urged The internal organ is also like soul an all-pervading substance inasmuch as it is the substratum of conjunctions which are the non coinherent causes of cognitions &c, why therefore has not its infinite greatness been enounced? In reply to this it is stated that in consequence of the non existence of that universal pervasion the internal sensory is absolutely small is not possessed of infinitely great extension The proof that the internal organ as determinant of non simultaneity of cognitions is absolutely small results from the impossibility of evidence cognisant of an object of the forementioned inference probative of universal pervasion V

गुणैर्दिग् व्याख्याता ॥ २४ ॥

Aph 24 By its qualities space is explained [to be all-comprehensive]

[1] नन्वात्मवन्मनोऽपि विभु ज्ञानाद्यसमवायिकारणसंयोगाश्रयत्वादिति तस्य महत्परिमाणं कुतो नाभिमतमत आह । तस्य विभवस्याभावान्मनोऽणु न परममहत्परिमाणवदित्यर्थः ज्ञानायौगपद्यनियामकतयाऽणुत्वमेव मनसः सिद्धं विभवसाधकप्रागुक्तानुमानस्य धर्मिग्राहकप्रमाणबाधितत्वादिति भावः ॥

[1] By its qualities characterised as priority and posteriority existing in all finite things and consisting of the common prior, posterior and other conceptions of beings existent in all divisions of the universe space also is explained to be all comprehensive. If it be asked how the notion and expression of ten spaces or quarters of the compass arise, whereas it is to be stated that relative conception having for its object the more and the less in conjunctions with the conjunct is the cause of the production of priority and posteriority, and whereas the conception of a plurality of spaces is contravened by the complexity of the conception or needlessness of the hypothesis, to this we reply that this is no valid objection inasmuch as it has been stated that the conception is determined by the particular accidents of space. U.

कारणे काल. ॥ २५ ॥

Aph. 25. Time relates to a cause.

[2] The designation time relates to a substance which is the *cause of the cognitions of the prior, posterior, reciprocal, simultaneous, non-simultaneous, slow and fast*. Such a cognition common to persons in all places would be impossible unless time were universally pervasive. Its universal pervasion is possession of infinite magnitude. Or (it may be argued) that in virtue of such

---

[1] गुणैः सकलद्वीपवर्तिपुरुषसाधारणपूर्व्वापरादिप्रत्ययरूपैः सकलमूर्त्तनिष्ठपरत्वापरत्वलक्षणैः दिगपि व्यापकत्वेन व्याख्यातेत्यर्थः परत्वापरत्वयोरुत्पत्तौ संयुक्तसंयोगभूयस्त्वाल्पीयस्त्वविषयापेक्षाबुद्धेः कारणत्वस्य वक्ष्यमाणत्वात् नानादिक्कल्पनस्य कल्पनागौरवप्रतिहतत्वात् कथं तर्हि दश दिश इति प्रतीतिव्यपदेशाविति चेत् तत्तदुपाधिनिबन्धनत्वादित्युक्तत्वात् ॥

[2] परापरव्यतिकरयौगपद्यायौगपद्यचिरक्षिप्रप्रत्ययकारणे द्रव्ये काल इतिसमाख्यानं तादृशः प्रत्ययः सर्व्वदेशपुरुषसाधारणः कालस्य व्यापकत्वमन्तरेण न सम्भवतीति तस्य व्यापकत्वं परममहत्त्वयोग इत्यर्थः । यद्वा इदानीं जातइत्यादिप्रतीतिबलात् सर्वोत्पत्तिमन्निमित्तकारणस्य कालस्य प्रतीयते तदपि व्यापकत्वाधीनं निमित्तकारणस्य समवायिसमवायिकारणप्रत्यासत्तिनियमात् । यद्वा अतीतानागतवर्त्तमानव्यवहारः सार्वत्रिक इति सर्वगत एव कालः । यद्वा क्षणलवमुहूर्त्तयामदिवाहोरात्रपक्षमासर्त्त्वयनसम्वत्सरादिव्यवहारकारणे द्रव्ये कालाख्यातिः व्यवहारस्य सार्वत्रिकत्वात्कालः सार्वत्रिक इति परममहान् तस्य नानात्वकल्पना च कल्पनागौरवप्रतिहतत्युक्तम् ॥

cognitions as born now &c. time is the occasional cause of all that is produced and this is dependent on universal pervasion, for an occasional cause is the condition of the apprehension of the co inherent and non coinherent cause Or another argument might be that the notion of past present and future is applicable to all objects and therefore time is existent everywhere Or that the designation time relates to the conventional divisions of moments *lavas* hours watches days days and nights lunar fortnights seasons half years years &c and this conventional division being of universal application time is everywhere existent, and consequently infinitely great It has been explained that the conception of a plurality of times is contravened by the complexity of the hypothesis U

SECOND DAILY LESSON

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शव्यतिरेकार्थान्तरमेकत्वम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1 Because of the exclusion of colour taste smell and touch unity is a different object

[1] The investigation of number and individuality is commenced after that of extension because magnitude is the cause of the perceptibility of number &c Unity is a different object different from colour &c not having colour &c for its form The term unity implies number and the four succeeding qualities viz extension individuality, conjunction and disjunction The object of such cognitions as Space is one Time is one &c must be allowed to be some quality different from colour &c because of the exclusion of colour, taste smell and touch that is because of the non-

[1] महत्त्वस्य संख्यादिप्रत्यक्षहेतुत्वात् परिमाणनिरूपणानन्तरमेव संख्यापृथक्त्वयो र्निरूपणमारभते । एकत्वम् अर्थान्तरं रूपादिभ्यो भि नतु रूपादिस्वरूपम् एकत्वपदं संख्यादिपञ्चकोपलक्षकं गगनमेकं काल एकः इत्यादिप्रतीतिविषयो रूपादिभिन्नो गुणो ऽवश्यमङ्गीकार्य्यः गगनादिषु रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शव्यतिरेकात् रूपादीनामभावादित्यर्थः नचैकं सामान्यमेकाविशेष एकः समवाय एकोऽभाव इत्यादिप्रतीतेः का गतिरिति वाच्यं तत्रा नाश्रयत्वाधीनजगौणविषयत्वरूपस्यैकत्वस्य भानाङ्गीकारादधि मन्यत्रानुसन्धेयम् ॥

existence of colour &c in space &c It cannot be urged What is the case with such cognitions as one generality, one particularity, one co inhesion, one non existence &c, for we must admit in regard to these independently a notion of unity constituted by their being the object of a modification of the intellect V

तथा पृथक्त्वम ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Likewise individuality

[1] The similarity of the quality individuality to number is stated Individuality also is like number another quality In this quality single individuality is like the number unity and dual individuality &c is like the numbers duality, &c *Nor is it* to be argued that there being observed a community of object in the cognitions, The water pot is individually apart from the piece of cloth, or other than, or different from it, individuality is only reciprocal non existence, and not another quality, for did the negative particle signify no difference from the word apart as an adverb there could be no dissimilarity between the cognitions This *is apart and This is not* V

एकत्वैकपृथक्त्वयोरेकत्वैकपृथक्त्वाभावो ऽणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्या व्याख्यात ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The non existence of unity and single individuality in unity and single individuality is explained by smallness and greatness

[2] It may be objected that in virtue of such cognitions as one

---

[1] पृथक्त्वगुणस्य सख्यातुल्यत्वमाह । पृथक्त्वमपि सख्यावद्गुणान्तरमेव तत्रैकपृथक्त्वम एकत्वसख्यातुल्य द्विपृथक्त्वादिकञ्च द्वित्वादिसख्यातुल्यमिति नच घट पटात पृथगन्या भिन्न इत्यादिप्रतीतीना समानविषयकत्वानुभवादन्योन्याभाव एव पृथक्त्व नतु गुणान्तरमिति वाच्य नञशब्दस्यैव पृथकशब्दस्याप्यव्ययतयाऽभेदार्थकतयाच अस्मात् पृथक इदमिद नेति प्रतीत्योर्वैलक्षण्यानुपपत्ते ॥

[2] नन्वेकमेकत्वमित्यादिव्यवहारबलादेकत्वेऽप्येकत्वमेवमेकपृथक्त्वद्विपृथक्त्वात्पृथगितिव्यवहारबलादेकपृथक्त्वेऽप्येकपृथक्त्वमङ्गीकार्य्यमिति तयोर्गुणत्व दुर्घट गुणेऽपि सत्त्वादतआह । यथाऽणुत्वमहत्त्वे नाणुत्वमहत्त्वयोस्तथाएकत्वैकपृथक्त्वयोरपि नैकत्वैकपृथक्त्वे व्यवहारस्तु प्रकारान्तरेणोपपादनीयइत्यर्थ ॥

unity, there exists unity in unity, and in like manner in virtue of such cognitions as that single individuality is individuality apart from dual individuality, single individuality must be admitted to exist in single individuality, and that consequently there is a difficulty involved in their being qualities, inasmuch as they exist in qualities In answer to this it is stated that as smallness and greatness do not exist in smallness and greatness, so also unity and single individuality do not exist in unity and single individuality, but this cognition is to be shown possible in some other manner V

निःसंख्यत्वात् कर्मगुणानां सर्वैकत्वं न विद्यते ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Unity does not exist in all things, for actions and qualities are void of number

[1] It may be asked as the notion of unity is common to qualities and to actions what reason there is to conclude that the unity which exists in substances does not exist in qualities &c Unity does not exist in all things If it be asked why it is replied that it is because actions and qualities are destitute of number Numberlessness is the state of those things that transcend number, that is, that are without number Accordingly actions and qualities are without number Inasmuch as number is a quality, number does not exist in qualities. Nor does it exist in actions, for qualities are denied of actions, for otherwise it would follow that actions were substances, and it has been demonstrated that number is a quality, and unity a number U

भ्रान्तं तत् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 That [notion] is erroneous

---

[1] ननु गुणेषु कर्मसु च साधारणएवैकत्वव्यवहारः किमत्र विनिगमकं यद्द्रव्यैकत्वं न गुणादिष्वित्यत आह । सर्व्वेषामेकत्वं तच्च विद्यते कुत इत्यत आह निःसङ्ख्यत्वात् कर्मगुणानामिति सङ्ख्याया निष्क्रान्ता हि सङ्ख्यास्तेषां भावो निःसङ्ख्यत्वम् तथा च कर्म्माणि गुणाश्च निःसङ्ख्यानि सङ्ख्याया गुणत्वेन गुणेषु तावत् सङ्ख्या न विद्यते नवा कर्म्मसु गुणानां कर्म्मसु निषेधात् अन्यथा द्रव्यत्वप्रसङ्गात् साधितञ्च सङ्ख्याया गुणत्वमेकत्वस्य च सङ्ख्यात्वमिति भावः ॥

[1] It may be asked How then the notion of one colour, one taste &c ? It is stated in reply that the notion of unity in relation to qualities and actions is erroneous In the aphorism there is an ellipse of the word notion, this being the subject previously mentioned The notion thus applied is derivative and derived from essential inseparability, but this is not unity, for it has been stated to be other than unity U

एकत्वाभावाद्भक्तिस्तु न विद्यते ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 In consequence of non existence of unity, secondariness does not exist.

[2] It may be asked Say that this notion of unity be secondary or derivative in relation to substances also, and the cognition be erroneous in relation to them, then what of unity? To this the reply is a *follows* *If* unity be no where taken in its primary *sense*, the notion thus applied cannot be secondary, for the secondary has for its antecedent the primary Nor is the conception erroneous for error has for its antecedents certain knowledge it being the certainly known that is erroneously attributed, for imputation of the unreal [as taught by the Vedántins] is rejected by the establishment of imputation of the elsewhere experienced [as taught by the Vaiśeshikas]

कार्यकारणयोरेकत्वैकपृथक्त्वाभावादेकत्वैकपृथक्त्वं न विद्यते ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Of cause and effect there is not unity and single individuality, *in consequence of the non-existence of unity and* single individuality

---

[1] तर्हि कथमेकं रूपमेकोरस इत्यादिज्ञानमित्यत आह । गुणकर्म्मसु यदेकत्वज्ञानं तद् भ्रान्तमित्यर्थ सूत्रे च ज्ञानमितिशेष प्रक्रिन्तपूर्व्वपक्षत्वस्य प्रयोगस्तु भाक्त स्वरूपा भेद एवस्य भुक्ति नच तदेकत्वमुक्तोत्तरत्वात् ॥

[2] ननु द्रव्येष्वप्येकत्वयोगोभाक्तो स्तु तत्र भ्रान्त किमेकत्वेनेत्यत आह । यदि पारमार्थिकमेकत्वं क्वचिन्नाभ्युपगन्तव्य तदा न प्रयोगो भाक्त मुख्यपूर्व्वकत्वाद्भक्ते न वा प्रत्ययोभ्रान्त प्रमापूर्व्वकत्वाद्भ्रमस्य प्रमितं ह्यारोप्यते नाप्रमितम असत्ख्यातेर्निरासात् अन्यथाख्याते साधनादिति भाव ॥

[1] With the purpose of parenthetically rejecting the Sânkhya doctrine of the unity and single individuality and indivisibility of integrant parts and integrated wholes, it is stated that there is neither unity nor single individuality in cause and effect that is there resides no unity or single individuality in both the cause and its effect For this the reason assigned is that there do not exist in the cause and its effect unity and single individuality Unity is indivisibility single individuality is non-dissimilarity Since these do not exist in the sum of constituent parts and the constituted whole, the parts and the whole are not identical, for it is allowed on all hands that the thread is cognised as separate from the cloth and dissimilar to it V

एतदनित्ययोर्व्याख्यातम् ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 This is explained in relation to non-eternal [cause and effect]

[2] This—the possession of non existence of unity and single individuality by reason of possession of non existence of indivisibility and non dissimilarity—is affirmed of non eternal cause and effect Accordingly on the hypothesis of the indivisibility of the threads and cloth it would follow that in the case of the production

[1] अवयवावयविनोरैकत्वमेकपृथक्त्वञ्च नतु तयोर्भेद इति साङ्ख्यमतं प्रसङ्गान्निराकर्त्तुमाह । कार्य्यकारणयोर्नैकत्वं नचैकपृथक्त्वं किमप्येकत्वमेकपृथक्त्वं वा कार्य्यकारणोभयनिष्ठं न भवतीत्यर्थः । अत्र हेतुमाह कार्य्यकारणयोरेकत्वैकपृथक्त्वाभावात् एकत्वमभेदः एकपृथक्त्वमवैधर्म्यं तयोरभावात् तन्तु पटाद्भिन्नं पटविधर्मेत्यादिप्रतीतेः सर्व्वसिद्धत्वादिति भावः ॥

[2] एतदभेदावैधर्म्याभावप्रयुक्तैकत्वैकपृथक्त्वाभाववत्त्वम् अनित्ययोः कार्य्यकारणयोः कथितमित्यर्थः तथाच तन्तुपटयोरभेदाङ्गीकारे तन्तूत्पादनदशायां पट उत्पद्यते पटोत्पत्तिदशायां तन्तुरुत्पद्यते तन्तुनाशदशायां पटो नश्यति पटनाशदशायां तन्तुर्नश्यतीत्यादिप्रत्ययप्रयोगयोः प्रसङ्गः न चोत्पत्तिविनाशावप्रामाणिकौ आविर्भावतिरोभावाभ्यामेव तत्प्रतीत्युपपत्तेरिति वाच्यमाविर्भावाङ्गीकारेऽनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् तदुत्पत्तिस्वीकारे तु किमपराद्धं पटाद्युत्पत्तिभिः आविर्भावे आविर्भावस्योत्पादस्य चाङ्गीकारे आविर्भावस्य सार्व्वादिकत्वप्रसङ्गः नह्याविर्भावस्य सार्व्वादिकत्वं साङ्ख्यैरपि स्वीक्रियते वस्तुतः पट उत्पद्यते पटो विनश्यतीत्यादिकः सार्व्वलौकिकानुभव एवोत्पादविनाशसाधकः एकविषयकानुभवस्य विषयान्तरविषयकत्वस्वीकारे घटपटादेरप्यपलापापत्तिरित्यलमसदाग्रहेण ॥

of the threads the cloth would be cognised and said to be produced, in the case of the production of the cloth the thread would be cognised and said to be produced, in the case of the destruction of the threads, the cloth would be cognised and said to be destroyed, and in the case of the destruction of the cloth, the threads would be cognised and said to be destroyed Nor can it be maintained that production and destruction are no proofs, because it is possible that the cognition of these is caused merely by appearance and disappearance, for on the hypothesis of an appearance of an appearance there will result a regress to infinity On the hypothesis of their production, therefore, what fallacy is there involved in the production of the cloth &c ? And if the appearance in appearance be not allowed to be production, it follows that appearance is constant, but the constancy of appearance is not admitted even by the Sánkhyas In fact, the universal experience that the cloth is produced and destroyed and so forth, is proof of production and destruction, for if experience of one object be allowed to have another object for its object, we must deny also the water pot cloth, &c This error has been sufficiently discussed V

Conjunction. अन्यतरकर्मज उभयकर्मजः संयोगजश्च संयोगः ॥९॥

Aph 9 Conjunction is produced by the action of one of the two conjunct objects by the action of both, and by conjunction

[1] Uncontradicted cognition of the conjunct, is proof of the existence of conjunction As results may be inferred substance as

---

[1] संयोगे संयुक्तप्रतीतिरबाधिता प्रमाणं कार्याणि च अवयवसंयोगेषु द्रव्यमग्निसंयोगे पाकजरूपादयः प्रचये परिमाणविशेषः भेर्याकाशसंयोगे शब्द इत्याद्यूह्यम् । न चाविरलोत्पत्तिरेव संयोगः क्षणभङ्गपरिणामयोर्निरासात् अप्राप्तिपूर्विका प्राप्तिः संयोगः स चान्यतरकर्मजः क्रियावता श्येनेन निष्क्रियस्य स्थाणोस्तदभिमुखक्रियारहितस्य सक्रियस्यापि धावतः यथा धावता पुरुषान्तरेण पृष्ठदेशसंयोगः उभयकर्मजः मेषयोर्मल्लयोर्वा प्रत्येकं गृहीतसामर्थ्याभ्यामुभाभ्यामेव तज्जननात् तृतीयस्त्वङ्गुलितरुसंयोगाद्धस्ततरुसंयोगः स चैकस्मादपि भवति यथा तन्तुवीरणसंयोगात् पटवीरणसंयोगः क्वचिद्द्वाभ्यां संयोगाभ्यामेकः संयोगः यथा द्वाभ्यां तन्तुभ्यामाकाशस्य द्वौ संयोगौ ताभ्यामेक एव द्वितन्तुकपटस्याकाशेन संयोगः क्वचिच्च बहुभिरपि संयोगैरेकः संयोग आरभ्यते यथा दशभिस्तन्तुभिराकाशस्य दशसंयोगा एकमेव दशतन्तुकपटाकाशसंयोगमारभन्ते क्वचित्

proof of conjunction of integrant parts, colour &c produced by burning as proof of conjunction with fire, particular extension as proof of accretion, sound as proof of the conjunction of a kettle drum and ether and so forth Conjunction is not mere contiguous production; as excluding momentary interruption and modification, *conjunction is contact having non contact as its antecedent* This is produced by the action of one of the conjunct objects, as the conjunction of a hawk in motion with a motionless post, or the conjunction of one in motion with one not in motion towards him, as conjunction of a runner with back of another person running Conjunction is also produced by the action of both conjunct objects, as that of two rams or of two wrestlers this being produced by both, each having individually acquired the power The third kind

---

पुनरेकस्मादपि संयोगादसमवायिकारणात संयोगद्वयमुत्पद्यते यथा पार्थिवाप्ययो॰ परमाण्वो प्रथममनारम्भके संयोगे जाते पार्थिवे परमाणौ पार्थिवपरमाण्वन्तरेण आप्ये च परमाणावाप्यपरमाण्वन्तरेण च परमाणावाप्यपरमाण्वन्तरेण द्व्यणुकद्वयारम्भक संयोगद्वयमुत्पद्यते ताभ्या संयोगाभ्या सजातीयनिष्ठाभ्या द्व्यणुकद्वय युगपदारभ्यते तत्र य पार्थिवाप्यपरमाण्वोरनारम्भकसंयोग उत्पन्नस्तेनैकेनैव पार्थिवपरमाणुनाप्यद्व्यणुकेनैक संयोग॰ आप्यपरमाणुना पार्थिवद्व्यणुकेनापर संयोगो द्व्यणुकयोरुपाद्युत्पत्तसमकालमेव जायते कारणाकारणसंयोगेन कार्याकार्यसंयोगयोरवश्य जननात मूर्त्तविभूनामन्यतरकर्मज एव विभुनोस्तु न संयोग कारणाभावात कर्म तावत्तत्र नास्ति नच तेन कारणाकारण संयोगात कार्याकार्यसंयोगोऽपि नास्ति नित्यस्तु संयोगो न सम्भवति अप्राप्तिपूर्विकाया प्राप्ते संयोगत्वात नित्यत्वे तद्विघातात् एवञ्च सति विभागोप्यजस्तत्र स्यात नचेष्टापत्ति संयोगविभागयोर्विरोधिनोरविनश्यदवस्थयोरेकत्रानुपपत्ते किञ्च संयोग प्रति प्रयोजिका युतसिद्धि नच विभुनोस्तत्सम्भव साहि द्वयोरन्यतरस्य वा पृथग्गतिमात्र युताश्रयाश्रयत्व वा विनाशस्तु संयोगस्य समानाधिकरणाद्विभागादाश्रयनाशादपि क्वचित् यथा तन्तुद्वयसंयोगानन्तरमेकस्य तन्तोरवयवेऽर्थे कर्म जायते तेनाश्वन्तराद्विभाग क्रियते विभागादारम्भकसंयोगनाशस्ततस्तुविनाशस्तन्तुविनाशात् संयोगनाशो यत्र तन्तुद्वय चिर संयुक्त सदनुत्पन्नक्रिय भवति कश्चित्तु तन्त्ववयवकर्मणा यदा तन्त्वारम्भकसंयोगनाश क्रियते तदा तन्त्वन्तरे कर्मचिन्तनात् आश्रयनाशविभागाभ्या युगपदुत्पन्नाभ्या संयोगो न श्यतीत्याहु । तञ्चानुपपन्न समवायिकारणनाशक्षणे विभागानुत्पत्ते समवायिकारणस्य कार्यसमकालस्थायित्वनियमात् सञ्जाय संयोगो द्रव्यारम्भ निरपेक्षो गुणकर्मारम्भे सापेक्ष स्वसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतीयोगी तथैवानुभवात शाखामात्रावच्छेदेनापि महति न्यग्रोधतरौ वर्तमान कपिसंयोग न्यग्रोधतरौ कपिसंयोग इत्यनुभवात अवच्छेदमात्रेणा न्यथासिद्धो परमाणुवृत्तिरापद्येत तथाच नोपलभ्येत विभूनामप्युपाधिभेद एव प्रदेशस्त दवच्छेदेन वर्तमानस्य संयोगस्याव्याप्यवृत्तित्व परमाणुनिष्ठस्यापि संयोगस्य दिगादयो ऽवच्छेदकाश्चिन्तनीया ॥

of the threads the cloth would be cognised and said to be produced, in the case of the production of the cloth, the thread would be cognised and said to be produced, in the case of the destruction of the threads, the cloth would be cognised and said to be destroyed, and in the case of the destruction of the cloth, the threads would be cognised and said to be destroyed Nor can it be maintained that production and destruction are no proofs, because it is possible that the cognition of these is caused merely by appearance and disappearance, for on the hypothesis of an appearance of an appearance there will result a regress to infinity On the hypothesis of their production therefore what fallacy is there involved in the production of the cloth &c ? And if the appearance in appearance be not allowed to be production, it follows that appearance is constant, but the constancy of appearance is not admitted even by the Sankhyas In fact, the universal experience that the cloth is produced and destroyed and so forth, is proof of production and destruction, for if experience of one object be allowed to have another object for its object we must deny also the water pot cloth, &c This error has been sufficiently discussed V

Conjunction. अन्यतरकर्मज उभयकर्मज सयोगजश्च सयोग ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Conjunction is produced by the action of one of the two conjunct objects by the action of both and by conjunction

[1] Uncontradicted cognition of the conjunct is proof of the existence of conjunction. As results may be inferred substance as

---

[1] सयोगे सयुक्तप्रतीतिरबाधिता प्रमाण कार्याणि च अवयवसयोगेषु द्रव्यमग्निसयोगे पाकजरूपादय प्रचये परिमाणविशेष भेर्याकाशसयोगे शब्द इत्याद्यूह्यम । न चाविरलोत्पत्तिरेव सयोग क्षणभङ्गपरिणामयोर्निरासात् अप्राप्तिपूर्विका प्राप्ति सयोग स चान्यतरकर्मज क्रियावता श्येनेन निष्क्रियस्य स्थाणोस्तदभिमुखक्रियारहितस्य सक्रियस्यापि धावत यथा धावता पुरुषान्तरेण पृष्ठदेशसयोग उभयकर्मज मल्लयोर्मेषयोर्वा प्रत्येक गृहीतसामर्थ्याभ्यामुभाभ्यामेव तज्जननात् तृतीयस्त्वङ्गुलितरुसयोगाद्धस्ततरुसयोग स चैकस्मादपि भवति यथा तन्तुवीरणसयोगात् पटवीरणसयोग क्वचिद्द्वाभ्या सयोगाभ्यामेक सयोग यथा द्वाभ्या तन्तुभ्यामाकाशस्य द्वौ सयोगौ ताभ्यामेक एव द्वितन्तुकपटस्याकाशेन सयोग क्वचिच्च बहुभिरपि सयोगैरेक सयोग आरभ्यते यथा दशभिस्तन्तुभिराकाशस्य दशसयोगा एकमथ दशतन्तुकपटाकाशसयोगमारभन्ते क्वचित्

proof of conjunction of integrant parts, colour &c produced by burning as proof of conjunction with fire; particular extension as proof of accretion, sound as proof of the conjunction of a kettle-drum and ether, and so forth Conjunction is not mere contiguous production; as excluding momentary interruption and modification, conjunction is contact having non-contact as its antecedent. This is produced by the action of one of the conjunct objects, as the conjunction of a hawk in motion with a motionless post, or the conjunction of one in motion with one not in motion towards him, as conjunction of a runner with back of another person running Conjunction is also produced by the action of both conjunct objects, as that of two rams or of two wrestlers, this being produced by both, each having individually acquired the power. The third kind

---

पुनरेकस्मादपि संयोगादसमवायिकारणात् संयोगद्वयमुत्पद्यते यथा पार्थिवाप्ययोः परमाण्वो प्रथममनारम्भके संयोगे जाते पार्थिवे परमाणोः पार्थिवपरमाण्वन्तरेण आप्ये च परमाणावाप्यपरमाण्वन्तरेण च परमाण्वाप्यपरमाण्वन्तरेण द्व्यणुकद्वयारम्भकं संयोगद्वयमुत्पद्यते ताभ्यां संयोगाभ्यां सजातीयनिष्ठाभ्यां द्व्यणुकद्वय युगपदारभ्यते तत्र यः पार्थिवाप्यपरमाण्वोरनारम्भकसंयोग उत्पन्नस्तेनैकेनैव पार्थिवपरमाणुनाप्यद्व्यणुकेनैकः संयोगः आप्यपरमाणुना पार्थिवद्व्यणुकेनापरः संयोगो द्व्यणुकयोरूपाद्युत्पत्तसमकालमेव जायते कारणाकारणसंयोगेन कार्याकार्यसंयोगयोरवश्य जननात् मूर्त्तविभूनामन्यतरकर्मज एव विभुनोस्तु न संयोगः कारणाभावात कर्म तावत्तत्र नास्ति नच तेन कारणाकारणसंयोगात् कार्याकार्यसंयोगोऽपि नास्ति नित्यस्तु संयोगो न सम्भवति अप्राप्तिपूर्विकायाः प्राप्तेः संयोगत्वात नित्यत्वे तद्विघातात् एवञ्च सति विभागोप्यजस्तत्र स्यात नचेष्टापत्तिः संयोगविभागयोर्विरोधिनोरविनश्यदवस्थयोरेकत्रानुपपत्तेः किञ्च संयोगं प्रति प्रयोजिका युतसिद्धिः नच विभुनोस्तत्सम्भवः साहि द्वयोरन्यतरस्य वा पृथग्गतिमत्त्वं युताश्रयाश्रयत्वं वा विनाशस्तु संयोगस्य समानाधिकरणाद्विभागादाश्रयनाशादपि क्वचित यथा तन्तुद्वयसंयोगानन्तरमेकस्य तन्तोरवयवेंऽशे कर्म जायते तेनावयवान्तराद्विभागः क्रियते विभागादारम्भकसंयोगनाशस्ततस्तुविनाशस्तन्तुविनाशात् संयोगनाशो यत्र तन्तुद्वय चिरं संयुक्तं सदनुत्पन्नक्रिय भवति केचित्तु तन्त्ववयवकर्मणा यदा तन्त्वारम्भकसंयोगनाशः क्रियते तदा तन्त्वन्तरे कर्मचिन्तनात् आश्रयनाशविभागाभ्यां युगपदुत्पन्नाभ्यां संयोगो नश्यतीत्याहुः । तच्चानुपपन्नं समवायिकारणनाशक्षणे विभागानुत्पत्तेः समवायिकारणस्य कार्यसमकालस्थायित्वनियमात् सचाय संयोगो द्रव्यारम्भे निरपेक्षो गुणकर्मारम्भे सापेक्षः स्वसमानाधिकरणात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगी तथैवानुभवात् शाखामात्रावच्छेदेनापि महति न्यग्रोधतरौ वर्तमानः कपिसंयोगः न्यग्रोधतरौ कपिसंयोग इत्यनुभवात् अवच्छेदमात्रेण न्यर्थासिद्धा परमाणुवृत्तिरापद्येत तथाच नोपलभ्येत विभूनामप्युपाधिभेद एव प्रदेशस्तदवच्छेदेन वर्तमानस्य संयोगस्याव्याप्यवृत्तित्वं परमाणुनिष्ठस्यापि संयोगस्य दिगादयोऽवच्छेदकाश्चिन्तनीयाः ॥

of conjunction or conjunction produced by conjunction is such as conjunction of the hand with a tree resulting from conjunction of a finger with the tree This moreover results from one conjunction as the conjunction of a piece of cloth with the grass may result from the conjunction of a thread and the grass In some cases one conjunction is produced by two conjunctions, as two conjunctions with ether may be produced by two threads and by these two conjunctions a single conjunction of a piece of cloth made of two threads with the ether In other cases a single conjunction is originated by a plurality of conjunctions as when ten conjunctions with ether originated by ten threads, originate a single conjunction between a piece of cloth made of ten threads and the ether Sometimes on the other hand two conjunctions are produced from one single conjunction as their non-coinherent cause, as when there having first taken place a non-originative conjunction between two atoms terrene and aqueous, subsequently two conjunctions originative of binary atomic aggregates are produced a conjunction in the terrene atom with another terrene atom and in the aqueous atom with another aqueous atom By these two conjunctions existing in homogeneous objects two binary atomic aggregates are simultaneously produced In these by the one non-originative conjunction produced in the terrene and aqueous atoms, a single conjunction of the terrene atom with the aqueous binary atomic aggregate and another conjunction of the aqueous atom with the terrene atomic aggregate are produced simultaneously with the production of colour &c. in the two binary aggregates, for the conjunction of a cause and non-cause must necessarily produce a conjunction of an effect and non-effect. The conjunction of all pervading entities with limited objects is produced by reciprocal action only Of two all pervading substances there is no conjunction for there is no cause of conjunction There exists in them no cation therefore there results in them no conjunction of effect and non effect from conjunction of cause and non cause An eternal

conjunction is impossible, for conjunction is contact having non-contact as its antecedent, and this is repugnant to the nature of the eternal. Also in this case (were eternal conjunction possible), no disjunction could be therein produced. Nor can it be allowed (as involving no objection, that no disjunction is therein produced), for conjunction and disjunction reciprocally repugnant and of indestructible condition, are impossible. Moreover previous unconnectedness is a necessary condition of conjunction, and this consists in the individual movement of one or other of two objects, or co-inherence in *the substratum of the object joined.* Destruction results from disjunction in-coexistent with conjunction, or from disintegration of the site of the conjunction in some instances, as when after the conjunction of two threads, action is produced in that portion of a thread which constitutes its extremity, by this action there is effected disjunction from what now becomes the extremity, from this disjunction results destruction of the originant conjunction, from this results destruction of the thread, from destruction of the thread results destruction of the conjunction, where two threads having been long conjoined action is not produced in them. Some have maintained that when by action *in the portions of the thread there is effected destruction of the* conjunction originant of the thread, the conjunction is destroyed by destruction of the substratum and disjunction simultaneously produced, inasmuch as action is conceived to exist in another thread. This is impossible for disjunction is impossible at the moment of the destruction of the co-inherent or material cause, it being a law that the co-inherent cause is of equal duration with the effect. This conjunction is absolute in the origination of substances, and relative in the origination of qualities and actions, non-existent in the case of the absolute non-existence of its proper substratum, *for it is observed to be so.* The conjunction existing between an ape and a great sacred fig-tree limited to conjunction with the branches only, exists, inasmuch as it is observed that there exists

in the sacred fig tree conjunction with the ape For were it to be accounted for otherwise than by such mere limitation, conjunction might possibly reside in an ultimate particle, and consequently be not cognisable Locality is an accidental difference of all pervading substances, and conjunction as determined in position must be less than co-extensive with them Of conjunction residing in an ultimate particle, space &c may be regarded as determinant U

एतेन विभागो व्याख्यातः ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 By this disjunction is explained

[1] The analogy of conjunction to disjunction is stated. Disjunction also is of three kinds as divided into that produced by the action of one of the disjunct objects that produced by the action of both and that produced by disjunction Of these the first is instanced in the disjunction of a hawk from a mountain, the second in that of two rams retiring from conflict, the third is of two kinds being ether produced by the disjunction of causes only, or by the disjunction of causes and non causes Of these disjunctions produced by disjunction the former class is exemplified where

---

[1] विभागे संयोगतन्त्रतामाह । विभागोऽपि त्रिविधः एककर्मजोभयकर्मजविभागजभेदात् तत्राद्यः श्येनशैलयोः द्वितीयो मेषयोः तृतीयस्तु त्रिविधः कारणमात्रविभागजन्यः कारणाकारणविभागजन्यश्चेति तत्राद्यो यथा प्रथमं कपाले कर्म ततः कपालद्वयविभागः ततो घटारम्भकसंयोगनाशस्ततो घटनाशस्ततस्तेन कपालद्वयविभागेन कपालस्याकाशादिना विभागो जन्यते ततः कपालाकाशादिसंयोगनाशः ततः उत्तरदेशसंयोगस्ततः कर्मनाश इति नच प्राथमिकेन कपालकर्मणा कथं कपालाकाशविभागो न जन्यते इति वाच्यम् एकस्य कर्मण आरम्भकसंयोगप्रतिद्वन्द्विविभागजनकस्यानारम्भकसंयोगप्रतिद्वन्द्विविभागजनकत्वविरोधात् अन्यथा विकसत्कमलकुड्मलादिभङ्गप्रसङ्गात् तस्मादनारम्भकाकाशकपालसंयोगप्रतिद्वन्द्विविभागो न कपालकर्म जनयेत् तस्य घटारम्भकसंयोगप्रतिद्वन्द्विविभागजनकत्वात् नच कपालविभागेनैव घटनाशात् पूर्वं कुतः कपालाकाशविभागो न जन्यत इति वाच्यम् आरम्भकसंयोगप्रतिद्वन्द्विविभागवतोऽवयवस्य सति द्रव्ये देशान्तरविभागासम्भवात् कारणाकारणविभागजन्यविभागो यथा यत्र हस्तक्रियया हस्ततरुविभागस्तेन शरीरतरुविभागो जायते तत्र च हस्तक्रिया न कारणं व्यधिकरणत्वात् शरीरे तु तदा क्रिया नास्ति अवयविक्रियाया यावदवयवक्रियानियतत्वात् अतस्तत्र कारणाकारणविभागेन कार्याकार्यविभागो जन्यते इति अयमस्माद्विभज्यते इति प्रत्ययसिद्धोऽयं विभागः गुणः संयोगनाशेन नान्यथासिद्ध इति संक्षेपः ॥

firstly action is produced in one of the two halves of a water-pot, thence *disjunction of the two halves of the vessel thence* destruction *of the* conjunction *originant of the water pot thence destruction* of the water pot then by *disjunction of the two halves of the* water pot disjunction *of* the halves *from* the circumjacent *ether* &c. thence destruction of the conjunction of the halves with ether &c, thence conjunction with another place, thence destruction of the action Nor is it to be urged in objection How is it that disjunction of the halves of the water pot from the ether in which they were situated while component parts of the vessel is not produced by the primary action in the halves of the water pot? For one action productive of disjunction repugnant to the originative conjunction is contradictory to production of disjunction repugnant to non originative conjunction (such as that of the halves of the vessel with the ether circumjacent), since otherwise there would follow the possibility of the breaking of the buds of a full-blown lotus. The action then in the halves of the vessel cannot produce disjunction repugnant to the non originative conjunction of the halves of the water-pot and the ether inasmuch as such action produces disjunction repugnant to the conjunction originative of the water-pot Nor can it be objected Whence is it that *disjunction of the halves of the vessel and the ether is not* produced by the *mere* disjunction of the two halves, *previously to the* destruction of the water-pot? For disjunction from another place is impossible in an existing substance in any portion possessed of disjunction repugnant to the originative conjunction Disjunction produced by disjunction of causes and non-causes is exemplified where by action of the hand disjunction of the hand from a tree is produced and by this mediately disjunction of the body from the tree In this disjunction the action of the hand is not the cause for there is a difference of substratum But there is not at that time action in the body, for the action of a composite whole is determined as the action of the sum of the constituent parts. In

this case, therefore, there is produced by disjunction of cause and non cause a disjunction of effect and non-effect. This same quality, disjunction, is proved to exist by the presentative cognition that one object is disjoined from another, and is not therefore otherwise accounted for or unnecessarily assumed. V.

संयोगविभागयोः संयोगविभागाभावोऽणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्यां व्याख्यातः ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11. The non-existence of conjunction and disjunction in conjunction and disjunction is explained by smallness and greatness

[1] Conjunction and disjunction are not possessed of conjunction and disjunction, as smallness and greatness are not possessed of smallness and greatness, for qualities have no qualities V.

कर्मभिः कर्माणि गुणैर्गुणा अणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्यामिति ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Actions [are explained to be void] of actions and qualities by smallness and greatness

[2] The aphorism Actions &c is repeated for clearness, or to aid the memory Its meaning has been already expounded. (VII 1 15) V.

युतसिद्ध्यभावात् कार्यकारणयोः संयोगविभागौ न विद्येते ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 Inasmuch as there is non existence of unconnectedness, there exist not conjunction and disjunction in an effect and its cause

[3] A solution of the difficulty why there should not be con-

---

[1] संयोगविभागौ न संयोगविभागवन्तौ यथाऽणुत्वमहत्त्वे नाणुत्वमहत्त्ववती गुणानां निर्गुणत्वादित्यर्थः ॥

[2] कर्मभिरिति सूत्रं स्पष्टार्थं स्मरणार्थं वा पुनरुक्तम् अस्यार्थः प्रागेवाभिहितः ॥

[3] ननु अवयवावयविनोः कथं न संयोगविभागावित्याशङ्कायामाह । युतसिद्धिः परस्परसम्बन्धशून्ययोरवस्थानं कार्यकारणयोरवयवावयविनोर्न संयोगविभागौ वर्तेते युतसिद्ध्यभावात् नहि घटाद्यवयवी कपालाद्यवयवासम्बन्धः सन् तिष्ठति येन तयोः संयोगविभागौ सम्भाव्येयातामिति ॥

junction and disjunction in constituent parts and constitutes wholes, is stated Unconnectedness is the state of two objects void of *mutual connection* Conjunction and disjunction do not exist in a cause and its effect that is in the constituent parts and the constituted whole inasmuch as there is non existence of unconnectedness For a constituted whole a water pot and the like does not remain in existence out of connection with its constituent parts the two halves of the vessel &c, that conjunction and disjunction should be possible in the integrant parts and the integrate whole V

गुणत्वात् ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 Inasmuch as it is a quality [a word has not conjunction with the object which it denotes]

[1] A previously supposed view is here stated with the purpose of establishing that there exists between a term and its designates a connection of power in obviation of the difficulty —How can there be a conjunction between a verbal sign and its significate, for a word or sound being a quality cannot possess any quality nor is it to be replied that *there exists not between them any conjunction for were* that the case there might result from such a verbal sign as water pot the verbal apprehension of a piece of cloth there being no speciality of connection The term denotative being a quality there can exist therein no conjunction with the object denoted that is with the water pot, &c. V

गुणो ऽपि विभाव्यते ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 A quality also is implied

[1] ननु शब्दार्थयोः कथं संयोगः सम्भवति शब्दस्य गुणत्वेन गुणवत्त्वासम्भवात् न च नास्त्येव तयोः संयोग इति वाच्यं सम्बन्धत्वाविशेषेण घटादिशब्दात् पटादिशाब्दबोधापत्तेरित्यतः पदपदार्थयोः शक्तिसम्बन्धव्यवस्थापयिषया पूर्वपक्षयति । प्रतिपादकस्य शब्दस्य गुणत्वात् तत्र प्रतिपाद्यस्य घटादेः संयोगो न सम्भवतीत्यर्थः ॥

[1] Moreover the object is sometimes characterised as as a colour, taste, &c., and with this conjunction is not possible, no quality being allowed to exist in a quality. Hence it is said that a quality also is an object—these words having to be supplied—, a quality, as colour &c may be the object of a word, but with this there can be no conjunction or connection. Or the sense may be that a quality also is implied or denoted by a word, and that the word can have no conjunction or connection with this quality. U

निष्क्रियत्वात् ॥ १६ ॥

Aph 16. Inasmuch as there is no action [in the term and the object denoted by it there exists no conjunction between them.]

[2] Similarly connection by conjunction cannot exist in substances such as ether denoted by such words as *sky*, for conjunction which is produced by action is impossible in the term designating and the object designated these being void of action. V

असति नास्तीति च प्रयोगात् ॥ १७ ॥

Aph 17. Inasmuch also as the expression *is not* is used of the non existent.

[3] Conjunction is impossible inasmuch as the object designated may not exist. It is therefore said: Inasmuch also as it is observed that the expression *is not*—and in virtue of the particle *also* is to be understood *will be*—is used of the non existence, of that which

---

[1] किञ्च विषयोऽपि क्वचिद्रूपरसादिलक्षणस्तेन संयोगो न सम्भवति गुणे गुणानङ्गीकारादित्याह । गुणोऽपि विषय इतिशेषः गुणोऽपि रूपादिः शब्दस्य विषयो नतु तेन समं संयोगः सम्बन्ध इत्यर्थः यद्वा गुणोऽपि शब्देन विभाव्यते प्रतिपाद्यते तेन च शब्दस्य न संयोगः सम्बन्ध इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] एवं गगनादिशब्दप्रतिपाद्ये आकाशादिद्रव्येऽपि संयोगस्य सम्बन्धता न सम्भवति प्रतिपाद्यप्रतिपादकयोः कर्मशून्यत्वेन क्रियाजनकस्य संयोगस्यासम्भवादित्यर्थः । गगनादिशब्दस्य गगनादेश्च निष्क्रियत्वात् संयोगो न सम्भवतीत्यर्थः ॥

[3] प्रतिपाद्यस्यावर्तमानत्वादपि संयोगो न सम्भवतीत्याह । असति अविद्यमाने नास्तीति चकाराद्भविष्यतीति च प्रयोगदर्शनात तथाचातीतघट इदानीं नास्ति परदिने घटो भविष्यतीत्यादिप्रयोगेण अतीतानागतघटयोर्बोधो भवति नच ताभ्यां शब्दस्य संयोगादिः सम्भवतीत्यर्थः ॥

is not known to be Thus by reason of the expressions, The past water-pot does not now exist, Tomorrow the water-pot will exist, there results a cognition of a past and a future water-pot, and there can be no conjunction &c between them and words. V.

शब्दार्थावसम्बन्धौ ॥ १८ ॥

Aph 18 The word and its meaning are without connection

[1] If there be conjunction between the word and its meaning it follows that the word and its meaning are without connection U.

संयोगिनो दण्डात् समवायिनो विशेषाच्च ॥ १९ ॥

Aph 19 [The cognition] of that which possesses conjunction [results from knowledge of the conjunct as] from a staff, and [the cognition] of that which possesses co-inhesion [results] from the particular.

[2] It is stated that there is no cognition conversant about conjunction and other connections between a word and its meaning. From a staff—*being conversant about a staff—results a cognition* (for these words are to be supplied) of that which possesses conjunction—of a man possessing conjunction with the staff, and from the particular—being conversant about a particular constituent element—results a cognition of that which possesses co-inherence—of *a constituted whole There is, then, no cognition of the term water*-pot as possessing a water-pot, or of a water-pot as possessing the word water-pot, as there is a cognition, conversant about connec-

[1] शब्दार्थयोः संयोगश्चेदस्ति तदैतदापातं शब्दार्थावसम्बन्धावित्यर्थः ॥

[2] शब्दार्थयोः संयोगादिसंसर्गावगाही प्रत्ययोऽपि नास्तीत्याह। दण्डात् दण्डमवगाह्य संयोगिनः दण्डसंयोगिनः पुरुषस्य विशेषादवयवविशेषमवगाह्य समवायिनोऽवयविनः प्रतीतिर्भवतीति शेषः तथाच यथा संयोगसम्बन्धावगाही दण्डी पुरुष इति प्रत्ययः समवायसम्बन्धावगाही करी कुञ्जर इति प्रत्ययश्च स्यारमिको नाकानां तथा घटवान् घटशब्दः घटशब्दवान् घट इत्यादिप्रत्ययो नास्तीति घटपदार्थयोर्न संयोगो नवा समवायः सम्बन्ध इत्यर्थः। करी कुञ्जर इत्यादौ तु स्वानुयोगिकसमवायः संसर्गतया भासते कपालं घटवदित्यादौ तु समवाय एवेत्यादिकमूहनीयम् ॥

tion by conjunction of a man with a staff, and a cognition conversant about connection by co-inherence, of an elephant with a trunk, current among men Therefore there is no connection of conjunction or of co inhesion between the denotative term and the object denoted V

सामयिकः शब्दादर्थप्रत्ययः ॥ २० ॥

Aph 20 The recognition of a meaning from a word is conventional

[1] It may be asked, If there be neither conjunction nor co inherence between a word and its meaning, by what connection does a term convey a determinate sense? To this the reply is furnished It is conventional Convention is the arbitrary dispensation of the Deity, that by such and such a word such and such a sense is to be understood Whatever word was arbitrarily assigned by the Supreme Being to any meaning conveys that meaning it is the

[1] ननु यदि न संयोगो नापि समवायः शब्दार्थयोस्तर्हि केन सम्बन्धेन शब्दो नियतमर्थं प्रतिपादयतीत्यत आह । सामयिक इति समय ईश्वरसङ्केतः अस्माच्छब्दादयमर्थोऽवबोद्धव्य इत्याकारः य शब्दो यस्मिन्नर्थे भगवता सङ्केतितः स तमर्थं प्रतिपादयति स चाच शब्दार्थयोरीश्वरेच्छैव सम्बन्धः स एव समयस्तदधीन इत्यर्थः यथा नकुलदष्ट्रापस्पृष्टा या काचिदोषधिः सा सर्वाऽहि सर्पविषं हन्ति सच समयः क्वचिद्व्यवहारादवगतो यथा प्रयोजकेन घटमानयेत्युक्ते प्रयोज्यस्य कम्बुग्रीवावन्तमर्थमानयतीतिज्ञानं तावदनुमिनोति तटस्थो बालः इयमस्य प्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञानजन्या प्रवृत्तित्वात् मत्प्रवृत्तिवत् तच्च ज्ञानमेतद्वाक्यजन्यमेतदनन्तरभावित्वात् एतज्ज्ञानविषयो ऽयं कम्बुग्रीवावानर्थो घटपदवाच्य इत्यावापोद्वापप्रक्रियया बालस्य घटपटादावर्थे व्युत्पत्तिः क्वचिच्च साक्षादाप्तवाक्यादेव यथाऽयं कम्बुग्रीवावानर्थो घटपदवाच्य इति क्वचिदुपमानात् यथा गोसदृशो गवयो यथा मुद्गस्तथा मुद्गपर्णी यथा माषस्तथा माषपर्णीत्यादि साधर्म्योपमानात् क्वचिन्निन्दाकारादपि वाक्यात् यथा धिक् करभमतिलम्बोष्ठं दीर्घग्रीवं कठोरकण्टकाशिनमपसदं पशूनामिति निन्दावाक्यश्रवणानन्तरं तादृशपिण्डमुपलभ्यायमसौ करभ इति व्युत्पत्तिः क्वचित् प्रसिद्धपदसमानाधिकरण्यात् यथा प्रभिन्नकमलोदरे मधूनि मधुकरः पिबतीति वाक्यश्रवणानन्तरं भवत्ययमसौ मधुकरपदवाच्यः प्रभिन्नकमलोदरे मधुपानकर्तृत्वात् यथा वा सहकारतरौ मधुरं पिको रौतीति । तदेतदनुमानं वा शब्दः एव वा प्रसिद्धपदसमानाधिकरण्यमात्मव्युत्पादकं उपमानविशेष एव वा मधुपानकर्तृत्वस्य भ्रमरादिव्यक्त्यन्तरसाधर्म्यस्योपनयात् । समयश्च जातिमात्रे व्यक्तावेव वा उपस्थित इति तौतातिका जातौ व्यक्तौ चोभयशक्तिः किन्तु जात्यंशे ज्ञाता व्यक्त्यंशे स्वरूपसती प्रयोजिकेति प्राभाकराः । समय शक्तिरेव व्यक्त्याकृतिजातयः पदार्थ इति वृद्धाः । गवादिपदानामिदं मतं गुणकर्मादिवाचकपदानान्तु जातिव्यक्ती पदार्थ इति मयूखे विपश्चितम् ॥

will of God that is the connection between term and its signification This connection *is a convention, that is, it is dependent upon* convention, as whatever plant the ichneumon touches with his teeth is an antidote to poison This convention is sometimes derived from common usage, as for instance when any one gives the order Bring the water-pot, and a child standing by infers the cognition of another who receives the order and brings an object possessing a tubular neck, the child inferring that this activity of the bringer *is produced by knowledge, inasmuch as it is an activity* like its own activity, and that this knowledge is produced by the words of the person who gives the order, because it is brought into being subsequently to those words The child's knowledge of the *meaning* of water pot, piece of cloth, *is by the process of insertion* and elimination of words, in that the object of this knowledge is an object possessing a tubular neck denoted by the word water pot. At other times this convention results from direct testimony, as that this tubular-necked *object is designated by the* term water pot At other times it results from comparison or recognition of similarity, as through the judgment of similarity that a gayal is like a cow, mudga parni (a kind of bean) is like mudga, *masha-parni (a leguminous plant) is like a bean At other times* it results from opprobrious language as when after hearing, O the camel with pendulous upper lip and long neck the eater of hard thorns the vilest of animals,—on seeing such an object there ensues *the verbal knowledge that it is a camel At other times it results* from collocation with terms of known import, as when after hearing the proposition, The bee is sipping sweets in the cloven lotus blossom, it is inferred that this must be that which is denoted by the word bee inasmuch as this is the agent in the drinking of nectar in the cleft hollow of the lotus, or as in the common example, The cuckoo sings sweetly in the mango tree This is therefore, an inference or even a mere sound producing etymological knowledge, through the *force* of collocation with words known import Or it is a kind

of knowledge by comparison, through subsumption of similarity to other individual bees &c, viz agency in the drinking of nectar The convention, according to the followers of Tutata has reference only to the universal, being applied to the individual only by a transference According to the Prabhákaras the denotative capacity is expressive of both the class and the individual, but is cognised in relation to the universal, and by its essential form determines the cognition of the individual The ancients teach that the convention is the verbal power, and that objects are universals which are the forms of the individuals This is the case with terms like cow &c, but the object of words expressive of qualities, actions &c., is both the universal and the particular, as is detailed in the Mayukha. U

That connection between words and objects which produces verbal knowledge, is now pointed out The knowledge of the

---

[1] इदानीं शाब्दबोधोपयिकं पदपदार्थयोः सम्बन्धं प्रदर्शयति । शब्दादर्थप्रत्यय सामयिकः समयरूपसम्बन्धप्रयोज्यस्तथाच पदपदार्थयोः समयरूपः सम्बन्ध एव शाब्द बोधनियामकः समयश्च सङ्केतः सच द्विविधो नित्य आधुनिकश्च तत्र नित्यसङ्केतः शक्तिः आधुनिकसङ्केतः परिभाषा सङ्केतश्चास्माच्छब्दादयमर्थो बोद्धव्य इत्याकारकः अयं शब्दः इममर्थं बोधयत्वित्याकारको वा तदुक्तम । आजानिकश्चाधुनिकः सङ्केतो द्विविधः स्मृतः । नित्य आजानिकस्तत्र या शक्तिरिति गीयते । कादाचित्कस्त्वाधुनिकः शास्त्र कारादिभिः कृतः ॥ इति शक्तिग्रहश्च व्यवहारादितो भवति तदुक्तम शक्तिग्रहं व्याकरणोपमानात् कोषाप्तवाक्याद्व्यवहारतश्च । सान्निध्यतः सिद्धपदस्य वृद्धा वाक्यस्य शेषाद्विवृतेर्वदन्ति इति । धातुप्रकृतिप्रत्ययादीनां शक्तिग्रहो व्याकरणाद्भवति यथा कर्मणि द्वितीया कर्तरि परस्मैपदम् इत्याद्यनुशासनात् कर्मत्वादौ द्वितीयादेः उपमानाद् गवादिसादृश्यज्ञानात् गवयत्वादिजात्यवच्छिन्ने गवयादिपदानां शक्तिग्रहः कोषात् गुणे शुक्लादयः पुंसि गुणिलिङ्गास्तु तद्वति । शीतं गुणे तद्वदर्थाः सुषीमः शिशिरो जडः ॥ तूर्णं द्वाद समुत्तिङ्गापिङ्गलौ भ्रामराकुने । इत्यमरकोषात् श्वेतादौ शुक्लादिशब्दानां शक्तिग्रहः कोकिलः पिकपदवाच्य इत्याद्याप्तवाक्यात् कोकिलादौ पिकादिपदानां शक्तिग्रहः प्रयोज्यप्रयोजकव्यवहारात् गोत्वादिविशिष्टे गवादिपदानां शक्तिग्रहः तथाहि यत्र प्रयोजकवृद्धेन गामानयेत्युक्तम तच्छ्रुत्वा प्रयोज्यवृद्धेन गौरानीता तदवधार्य पार्श्वस्थो बालो गवानयनं गामानयेति शब्दप्रयोज्यमवधारयति ततश्च गां बधान अश्वमानयेत्यावापोद्वापाभ्यां गवादिपदानां गोत्वविशिष्टगवादौ शक्तिं गृह्णाति प्रसिद्धार्थकपद सामानाधिकरण्यात् नीरूपः स्पर्शवान् वायुः सत्कृत्यालङ्कृता कन्या ददाति कुकुदः स्मृतः इत्यादौ रूपशून्यस्पर्शवदादौ वाय्वादिशब्दस्य कन्यादानादौ कुकुदादिशब्दस्य च शक्तिग्रह एवं वाक्यशेषादपि यथा यवपदस्य कङ्गुप्रभृतौ म्लेच्छानां दीर्घशूके च शिष्टानां व्यवहारात व्यवहारादेकमात्रशक्तिः परिच्छेत्तुमशक्यत्वात् नानार्थत्वस्य चान्याय्यत्वात्

meaning of words is conventional, or determined by the connection of convention It is, therefore, a connection of convention between the term and the object, that determines verbal knowledge Convention *is arbitrary arrangement This is of two kinds, eternal* and modern Eternal arbitrary arrangement is verbal power; modern arbitrary symbolism is terminology The arbitrary symbolism takes for its form, that such and such a sense is to be understood by such and such a word, or such and such a term shall convey such and such a signification It has therefore been said. Arbitrary symbolism has been declared twofold, original and modern. The original is eternal, herein is that which is called power, but the modern is occasional, imposed by scientific writers and others. The apprehension of power is from common usage, &c It has, therefore, been said The ancients have declared the apprehension of power to be from grammatical analysis, from knowledge of comparison, from lexicography, from testimony, and from usage, *from contiguity to a term of know import, from the* context, and from explication The apprehension of the power of roots, crude forms, and affixes, results from grammatical

---

यवमयश्चरुर्भवति इति श्रुतौ यवपदस्यार्थसन्देहे वसन्ते सर्वशस्यानां जायते पत्रशातनम् । मोदमानाश्च तिष्ठन्ति यवाः कणिशशालिनः ॥ इति विध्यर्थाकाङ्क्षया प्रवर्तमानाद्वाक्यशेषाद्दीर्घशूक एव यवपदस्य शक्तिग्रहः यथा वा स्वाराज्यकामोऽग्निष्टोमेन यजेत इत्यादिविधिशेषीभूतेभ्यः । यन्न दुःखेन सम्भिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरम् । अभिलाषोपनीतञ्च तत् सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम् ॥ इत्यादिवाक्येभ्यः स्वरादिपदस्य विजातीयसुखादौ शक्तिग्रहः । क्वचिद्विवरणादपि यथा पचति पाकं करोतीति तुल्यार्थकवाक्यात् कृत्यादौ तिङादेः शक्तिग्रह इति । तत्र जातावेव शक्तिर्न तु व्यक्तौ व्यभिचारादानन्त्याच्चेति मीमांसकाः तत्रापि प्राभाकरमते व्यक्तिं विना जातिभानस्यासम्भवात्तुल्यवित्तिवेद्यत्वादेव गामानयेत्यादौ व्यक्तेर्भानम् भट्टमते च सामानाधिकरण्यसम्बन्धेन कर्मत्वादौ गोत्वादेः प्रथममन्वयबोधः पश्चात्तु कर्मताया गोवृत्तित्वस्यानुमानं भवतीति । मण्डनाचार्यमते व्यक्तेर्लक्षणया भानं भवतीति । तदेतज्जातिशक्तिमतं न समीचीनं गामानयेत्यादौ व्यक्तेः शाब्दबोधविषयत्वस्यानुभवसिद्धस्य विना शक्तिमनुपपत्तेः न च लक्षणया व्यक्तेर्भानम् मुख्यप्रयोगस्यासत्त्वे लाक्षणिकप्रयोगासम्भवात् न च तुल्यवित्तिवेद्यतयापि व्यक्तेर्भानं सम्भवति कार्यीभूतशाब्दबोधविषयतायाः कारणप्रयोज्यत्वस्यावश्यकत्वेन नियमरूपस्य तुल्यवित्तिवेद्यत्वस्य तत्राप्रयोजकत्वादिति तस्माज्जात्याकृतिविशिष्टव्यक्तावेव गवादिपदानां शक्तिरितिमतमेवादरणीयम् तदुक्तं गौतमीये जात्याकृतिव्यक्तयस्तु पदार्थः इति ॥

analysis, as the knowledge from such rules as, The second case is used of the object, The transitive verb is of the agent, or that the accusative case &c is used of the object of the action &c From knowledge of comparison there results from knowledge of similarity to a cow &c. the apprehension of the power of the terms gayal &c in restriction to the classes gayal &c According to such lexicographical information as White and other terms connecting qualities, in the masculine denote the subject of the attribute, Cold is a quality, The words chill cool, and benumbed imply possession of that quality, and Powder is that which is triturated, Routed and panic striken denote extreme confusion,—according to such information there results apprehension of the power of the words white &c in reference to the white, &c Apprehension of the power of the terms *pika &c* in reference to a cuckoo &c., results from testimony such as A cuckoo is signified by the word *pika* From the practical relation of one who gives and one who receives an order, results apprehension of the power of the terms cow &c in reference to objects possessing the essential characters of a cow, &c. For instance when an adult giving an order says Bring the cow, and another adult receiving the order brings the cow, a child standing by observing this, reflects that the bringing of a cow is implied by the words Bring the cow , and afterwards by substitution of one word and elimination of the other in the phrase, Tie up the cow, Bring the horse he apprehends the power of the terms cow &c. in reference to cows characterised by a dewlap &c. From collocation with words of known import in such propositions as Air is colour less and tactile He who gives a girl in marriage with due ceremony and fittingly adorned is called *kukuda,* there results apprehension of the power of the terms air &c. in reference to objects colourless tangible &c., and of the terms *kukuda* &c in relation to those who give girls in marriage &c Similarly also apprehension of verbal power results from the context of words Thus since

the term barley is employed in the common usage of barbarians to denote panic seed and in that of civilized men to denote the long awned cereal if a doubt arise, in regard to the word barley in such sacred texts as *Charu* (a kind of oblation) is made of barley, it being impossible to restrict it to one meaning and illogical to understand it equivocally, apprehension that the power of the term barley is to denote the long awned cereal only, arises from the sequel of the the sentence which supplies the full sense of the injunction, viz In spring the leaves of all kinds of grain wither away, and the pleasant bearded barley still remains Or for example apprehension of the power of the terms elysium &c to designate a particular kind of bliss results from such words as That bliss which is not interrupted by pain which is not forthwith destroyed and which is obtained by desire is the object of the term elysium according to the sense of the context Let him that desires the lordship of heaven sacrifice an *agni shtoma* Apprehension of the power of terms sometimes also results from explication, as that of the personal terminations of the verb to designate action, as from He performs culinary operations as a *proposition identical with He cooks According to the Mimansakas* verbal power conveys the universal only and not the individual for did it apply to the individual it would be either unduly restricted or infinite in extension According to the doctrine of the Prábhákaras on this point in such sentences as Bring the cow there is a knowledge of the individual a knowledge of the universal apart from the particular being impossible the act and object of cognition being equal *According to the doctrine of* Bhaṭṭa there is first a knowledge of construction of the cow &c as the object of the verb by means of the connection of verbal collocation and afterwards an inference that it is the cow that is the object of the verb According to the doctrine of Mandanacharya the individual is designated by implication This doctrine of these authorities that verbal power designates the universal is not

correct, for unless in such instances as Bring the cow, the power had reference to the individual, the fact that the individual is the object of verbal knowledge could not be established as it is by experience. Nor does the knowledge of the individual arise from implication, for if the word be not used in its denotative function to use it in its implicative function is impossible Nor is a knowledge of the individual possible by equality of the act and the object of knowledge, for while the being an object of verbal knowledge which is an effect, must have a cause the equality of the act and object of cognition which is a necessary condition cannot be the cause We must therefore acquiesce in the doctrine that the power of the terms cow &c is *denotative of* an individual characterised by the form of the universal It has therefore been laid down in the aphorism of Gautama that particulars characterised by the form of the universal, are the object of the term V

Priority and posteriority — एकदिक्काभ्यामेककालाभ्या सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्यां परमपरञ्च ॥ २१ ॥

Aph 21 The prior and posterior [are produced] by two objects occupying the same space and time and near and remote.

[1] The term prior and posterior is used in an abstract sense The words are produced are to be supplied, also the prior and

[1] परमपरञ्चेति भावप्रधानो निर्देश उत्पद्यत इति शेष यद्वा परमपरञ्चेति व्यवहार इति शेष इतिरध्याहार्यम एका दिग ययोस्तावेकदिक्कौ ताभ्यामेकदिक्काभ्या पिण्डाभ्यामित्यर्थं तुल्यदेशावप्येकदिक्कौ भवत नतु ताभ्या परत्वापरत्वे उत्पद्येते यत्र ह्रियेते चेत्यत उक्त सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्यामिति सन्निकर्ष संयुक्तसंयोगाल्पत्वम् विप्रकर्षस्तद्भूयस्त्वम तद्वद्भ्यामित्यर्थ एतेन समवायिकारणमुक्तम दिक्पिण्डसंयोगस्त्वसमवायिकारणम तथाहि प्राङ्मुखस्य पुरुषस्य प्राच्यवस्थितयो पिण्डयोरेकस्मिन् संयुक्तसंयोगभूयस्त्वमपरस्मिन् संयुक्तसंयोगाल्पतरत्वञ्चापेक्ष्य परत्वमपरत्वञ्चोत्पद्यते असमवायिकारणमुक्तम सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्यामिति विपर्येण विपर्विश प्रत्ययमुपलक्षयति तथाचापेक्षाबुद्धे निमित्तकारणत्वमुक्तम् एकदिगवस्थितयोरेवपरत्वापरत्वे उत्पद्येते इति न सर्वदोत्पत्ति एकस्यैव द्रष्टुरपेक्षाबुद्धि समुत्पद्यत इति न सर्वदोत्पत्ति अपेक्षाबुद्धिनियमाच सर्वदोत्पत्ति कारणयतकत्पचयो प्रत्यक्षसिद्धत्वाच परस्पराश्रयत्वम अन्यथापि नोत्पद्ये

posterior may be an elliptical expression for the convention of the prior and posterior, the particle *iti* having to be supplied By *two objects occupying the same space*, that is of which there is the same space, and occupying the same time, that is, synchronous,—by these priority and posteriority are produced, or are cognised and named. It is therefore stated that they are produced by two objects near and remote, that is possessed of contiguity or paucity *of conjunctions* with the conjunct, and of remoteness, that is of plurality of conjunctions with the conjunct. Hereby the co-inherent cause is stated The non-coinherent cause is the con-

---

यातां नवा प्रतीयेयातां परस्परापेक्षायां हि द्वयोरनुत्पत्तिरप्रतीतिश्च स्यात् प्रतीयते च पर
त्वापरत्वे प्रतीतिश्च तयोर्नोत्पत्तिमन्तरेणेति एककालाभ्यामिति कालिकपरत्वापरत्वे
अभिप्रेत्य तन्नैककालाभ्यामिति एको वर्तमानः कालो ययोर्युवस्थविरपिण्डयोः तावेककालौ
ताभ्यामेककालाभ्यामित्यर्थः सन्निकर्षोऽल्पतरतपनपरिस्पन्दान्तरितजन्मत्वं विप्रकर्षश्च
बहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दान्तरितजन्मत्वम् अत्रापि विषयेण विषयिणीं बुद्धिमुपलक्षयति
तेन युवस्थविरपिण्डौ समवायिकारणे कालपिण्डसंयोगश्चासमवायिकारणम् अल्प
तरतपनपरिस्पन्दान्तरितजन्मत्वबुद्धिरपरत्वे बहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दान्तरितजन्मत्वबुद्धिः
परत्वे निमित्तकारणम् एतेन परत्वापरत्वे अनियतदिग्देशयोरपि पिण्डयोरुत्पद्येते
तत्र दैशिकपरत्वापरत्वयोः सप्तधा विनाशः उत्पादस्तु युगपदेव द्वयोरन्यथाऽन्यो
न्याश्रयः स्यात् अपेक्षाबुद्धिनाशात् संयोगस्यासमवायिकारणस्य नाशात् द्रव्यस्य च
समवायिकारणस्य नाशात् निमित्तासमवायिकारणयोर्नाशात् निमित्तसमवायिकारण-
योर्नाशात् निमित्तनाशासमवायिकारणनाशसमवायिकारणनाशेभ्यः । तत्रापेक्षाबुद्धि
नाशात् तावत् परत्वोत्पत्तिः परत्वसामान्यज्ञानं ततोऽपेक्षाबुद्धिविनाशस्तद्विनाशात्
परत्वविशिष्टद्रव्यज्ञानकाले परत्वनाशः द्वित्वनाशवदेव सर्वमूहनीयम् । असमवायि
कारणनाशादपि तद्यथा यदैवापेक्षाबुद्धिस्तदैव परत्वाधारे पिण्डे कर्म ततो यदैव
परत्वोत्पत्तिस्तदैव दिक्पिण्डविभागस्ततो यदा परत्वसामान्यज्ञानं तदा दिक्पिण्ड
संयोगनाशः ततः सामान्यज्ञानादपेक्षाबुद्धिनाशस्तदैव दिक्पिण्डसंयोगनाशात् पर
त्वापरत्वयोर्नाशः तत्र चापेक्षाबुद्धिनाशस्य परत्वनाशसमकालत्वाच्च तन्नाशकत्वम् नन्व
समवायिकारणनाशादपि गुणनाशे आत्ममनःसंयोगनाशादपि संस्कारादृष्टादीनां विनाशे
बहु व्याकुलं स्यादिति चेन्न विप्रकृष्टत्वेन परत्वस्य व्यापनात् परत्वाधारस्यान्यत्र गमने
विप्रकर्षाभावात् परत्वनिवृत्तिरावश्यकी नच तदा नाशकान्तरमस्तीत्यन्यथानुपपत्त्या
संयोगनाश एव नाशकः कल्प्यते संस्कारादृष्टादेः कार्यस्य स्मृतिसुखादेर्विरोधापि दर्श
नान्न तन्नाशकल्पना उपलक्षणञ्चैतत् अवधेर्द्रष्टुश्च तद्देशसंयोगनाशादपि परत्वापरत्वे
विनश्यतः युक्तेस्तुल्यत्वात समवायिकारणनाशादपि क्वचित् परत्वनाशः तथाहि यदा
पिण्डावयवे समुत्पन्नेन कर्मणाऽवयवान्तराद्विभागस्तदैवापेक्षाबुद्धिः विभागात् पिण्डारम्भ
कसंयोगनाशः परत्वसामान्यज्ञानं द्रव्यनाशात परत्वनाशोऽपेक्षाबुद्धिनाशश्च सामान्यज्ञा
नात तथाच यौगपद्याच्चापेक्षाबुद्धिनाशात् परत्वनाश इति क्वचिद्द्रव्यनाशापेक्षाबुद्धिन-
शाभ्यां परत्वनाशः तद्यथा पिण्डावयवे कर्मापेक्षाबुद्ध्योरुत्पादस्ततोऽवयवान्तरविभागः प-

junction of the object with space. For example, there are produced in a man standing with his face to the east priority and posteriority in relation to the plurality of conjunct conjunctions in *one of two bodies situated in the east, and to paucity of conjunct* conjunctions in another. The non-coinherent cause has thus been stated. In the words near and remote, there is by the object an indication of the subjective cognition. It is accordingly stated that the efficient cause is the cognition of relativity. Priority and posteriority are produced only between objects situated in the same space, *they do not therefore arise everywhere.* The relative conception belongs to only one observer, therefore they do not appear everywhere, for as determined by relative conception they are not everywhere produced. It being evinced by perception that they are produced in consequence of the power of their causes, *they are not reciprocally dependent, otherwise they would not be* produced or would not appear, for there could be no genesis or cognition of two objects each supposing the other as a pre-requisite whereas priority and posteriority do appear, and this appearance without their production would be impossible. The words by two objects occupying the same time have reference to priority and posteriority in time. This priority and posteriority is produced by two objects one young and the other old, in which there is exis-

रस्योत्पत्तिः सह भागक्रमयोगनाशसामान्यज्ञाने सता द्रव्यनाशापेक्षाबुद्धिनाशौ सहत्र परत्वनाशः क्वचिद्द्रव्यस्य संयोगस्य च नाशाभ्यां परत्वनाशः तद्यथा यदा द्रव्यावयव विभागस्तदैव पिण्डकर्मापेक्षाबुद्ध्योरुत्पादस्तदनन्तरमवयवसंयोगनाशदिक्पिण्डविभागय रुत्पत्तयः ततो द्रव्यनाशदिक्पिण्डसंयोगनाशापरत्वसामान्यबुद्धय ततो द्रव्यनाशदिक् पिण्डसंयोगनाशाभ्यां परत्वनाशः सामान्यबुद्ध्यपेक्षाबुद्धिनाश इति क्वचित् संयोगनाशा पेक्षाबुद्धिनाशाभ्यां परत्वनाशः तद्यथा परत्वाधारे पिण्डे कर्म तदा सामान्यज्ञानविभागौ ततोऽपेक्षाबुद्धिनाशदिक्पिण्डसंयोगनाशौ तत परत्वनाशः क्वचित् समवायिकारणासमवायि निमित्तनाशेभ्यः तद्यथा परत्वोत्पत्तिसमकालमवयवकर्मोत्पत्ति युगपत् तदनन्तरं पर त्वसामान्यज्ञानावयवविभागनाशदिक्पिण्डविभागाः तदनन्तरमपेक्षाबुद्धिनाशद्रव्यनाशादि क्पिण्डसंयोगनाशेभ्यो युगपत्परत्वस्य परत्वापरत्वयोर्वा दैशिकयोर्नाशः कालकृतयोस्तु परत्वापरत्वयोरसमवायिकारणनाशाभावात् नाशो नास्ति दैशिकयोर्दिक्पिण्डसंयोगनाशो ऽपि विकर्षे विप्रकर्षे नाशो यदा न तदा कालिकयोरपि न तयोः समवायिकारणनाशापेक्षाबुद्धि नाशात् द्वाभ्यामपि च यदा पूर्वमुत्पन्नयोः ॥

tence at the same time *Their contiguity is the being born at an in*terval of fewer revolutions of the sun, their remoteness is the being born at an interval of more revolutions of the sun There is *in this case also indicated by the object a subjective intellection* The two objects young and old are therefore, the co inherent cause The conjunction between time and these objects is the non coinherent cause The conception of the being born at an interval of *fewer revolutions of the sun is the efficient cause of priority*, and the conception of the being born at an interval of more revolutions of the sun is the efficient cause of posteriority This priority and this *posteriority arise also in objects of determinate position in* space Of these there is a seven fold destruction of priority and posteriority in space but the production of the two is simultaneous, else there would be a regress to infinity Their destruction results from destruction of the relative conception *from* destruction of the non coinherent cause of the conjunction, from destruction of the substance which is the co inherent cause from destruc*tion of the efficient, and non coinherent causes, from destruction of* the efficient and co inherent causes and from the destructions of the efficient non coinherent and co-inherent causes. From destruction of the relative conception thus —the destruction of the cognition of relativity *is from the production of posteriority* that is from the general knowledge of posteriority from the destruction of the relative conception there results destruction of the posteriority in cognising a substance qualified by posteriority and *the whole process may be inferred according to the analogy of the* destruction of duality From destruction of the non-coinherent cause as when first there is a cognition of relativity, then action in the object which is the substratum of posteriority, thence *disjunction of the object and space when posteriority is produced*, thence destruction of the conjunction between space and the object, thence in consequence of the simple cognition destruction of the cognition of relativity, then from the destruction of the conjunction of

the object with space, destruction of the priority and posteriority In this instance the conception of relativity, though synchronous with the destruction of posteriority, is not destructive of it. If it be urged that there is much confusion involved in the supposition of the destruction of reproduction, necessity &c consequent on destruction of the conjunction of the soul and the internal organ in the destruction of qualities resulting from the destruction of the non-coinherent cause we reply that it is not so, for inasmuch as posteriority is pervaded by remoteness there must needs be a cessation of posteriority consequent on non existence of remoteness on the removal of the substratum of posteriority Nor is there at that time another agent of destruction, for it is the destruction of conjunction which is conceived as the agent of destruction such destruction being otherwise impossible Inasmuch as we observe long afterwards memory pleasure &c the effect of reproduction necessity &c we cannot suppose these to be destroyed This also implies the percipient as a limit and posteriority and priority are destroyed by the destruction of the conjunction between the percipient and space this being equally efficient Destruction of posteriority sometimes also results from destruction of the co inherent cause as for instance when by action produced in a portion of a body there is produced disjunction from another portion then a conception of relativity from this disjunction results destruction of the conjunction originative of the body and production of posteriority, in the succeeding moment from destruction of the conjunction there results destruction of the substance and the universal conception of posteriority, from the destruction of the substance there results destruction of posteriority and destruction of the cognition of relativity results from the simple cognition Destruction of posteriority therefore does not result from destruction of the cognition of relativity for they are simultaneous Destruction of posteriority is sometimes by destruction of the substance and of the cognition of relativity, as for in

stance when there arises in the portion of a body a relative cognition of action, thence disjunction from other constituent parts and production of posteriority, thence destruction of the originative conjunction and a simple cognition, thence destruction of the substance and of the relative cognition, thence destruction of posteriority Sometimes destruction of posteriority is by destruction of the substance and of conjunction, as when there arises disjunction of the constituent parts of a substance; then production of action in the body and of a relative cognition, next the production of destruction of the conjunction of the parts, of disjunction between the body and space, and of posteriority, thence destruction of the substance, destruction of the conjunction of the body, a universal cognition of posteriority, thence destruction of posteriority by destruction of the cognition of the body and space and destruction of the substance, according to the rule that a simple cognition destroys a relative cognition Destruction of posteriority is sometimes by destruction of conjunction and of the relative cognition, as when there successively ensue production of posteriority and action in the body, a simple cognition and disjunction destruction of the relative cognition and of the conjunction of the body with space, and thence destruction of posteriority Destruction of posteriority at other times results from destruction of the co inherent, non-coinherent, and efficient causes, as when there simultaneously arise production of posteriority, disjunction of the parts of the body, and action in the body, next a universal cognition of posteriority, destruction of the conjunction of constituent parts, and disjunction of the body from space, next from simultaneously produced destruction of the relative cognition of the substance, and of the conjunction of the body with space, there results destruction of priority or posteriority in space Of priority and posteriority in time there is no destruction dependent upon destruction of the non-coinherent cause nor is there destruction of contiguity and remoteness in temporal priority and posteriority, as there is destruc-

tion of contiguity and remoteness in priority and posteriority in space, where there is destruction of the conjunction of the body with space The three cases therefore of destruction of temporal priority and posteriority, from destruction of the co inherent cause, from destruction of the relative cognition and by both conjointly, are to be inferred *according to the analogy of the preceding* U

[1] The notion and expression of prior and posterior is produced by two bodies occupying the same space, that is, having the same space as their site and contiguous or remote that is objects of a

---

[1] एका दिक् आधारतया ययोस्तावेकदिक्कौ मूर्तौ ताभ्यां मूर्ताभ्यां संनिकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्यां बहुतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वाल्पतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानविषयाभ्यां परमपरश्चेति व्यवहारो जायते इत्यर्थः । तथाच दैशिकपरत्वं प्रति बहुतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणं तदाश्रये मूर्ते दिक्संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणं तादृशज्ञानविषयो मूर्तं समवायिकारणम् दैशिकापरत्वस्याल्पतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणं तद्विषयो मूर्तं समवायिकारणं तादृशमूर्ते दिक्संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणमिति भवति हि पाटलिपुत्रस्य काशीमपेक्ष्य प्रयागः परः प्रयागमपेक्ष्य काशी परेति व्यवहारः तद्विषयं परत्वं प्रयागे उत्पद्यते तत्र बहुतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वेन तस्य ज्ञातत्वात् । काश्यांश्चापरत्वं जायते अल्पतरमूर्तसंयोगाश्रयत्वेन तस्या ज्ञातत्वात् एककालाभ्यामिति एकः कालः संयोगितया ययोः पिण्डयोस्ताभ्यामेककालाभ्यां पिण्डाभ्यां संनिकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्याम् । अल्पतरतपनपरिस्पन्दबहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दाश्रयतया ज्ञाताभ्यां परमपरश्चेति व्यवहारो भवति भवति हि युवानमपेक्ष्य स्थविरः परः स्थविरमपेक्ष्य युवाऽपर इत्यादिको व्यवहारस्तद्विषयस्य परत्वस्य समवायिकारणं स्थविरः तत्र महाकालस्य संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् । बहुतरसूर्यक्रियाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणम् अपरत्वस्य च युवा समवायिकारणम् युवशरीरमहाकालयोः संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् *स्थविराश्रिततपनस्पन्दापेक्षयाऽल्पतरतपनस्पन्दाश्रयत्वेन यूनो ज्ञानं निमित्तकारणम्* यद्यपि शरीराणां बाल्ययौवनवार्द्धक्यभेदेन भिन्नत्वात् युवस्थविरगततपनपरिस्पन्दानां वैपरीत्यमपि सम्भवति तथापि बहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दसमानाधिकरणवैजात्यवत्त्वज्ञानमेव स्थविरे कालिकपरत्वस्य कारणम् अल्पतरतपनस्पन्दसमानाधिकरणवैजात्यज्ञानञ्च यून्यपरत्वस्य कारणमिति नच घटाद्यपेक्षया परमाणोरपि बहुतरसूर्यक्रियासमानाधिकरणपृथिवीत्वादिजातिमत्त्वज्ञानात् परत्वं कथं नोत्पद्यते इति वाच्यं बहुतरसूर्यक्रियासमानाधिकरणैककालीनद्रव्यावृत्तिजातिमत्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् तादृशजातिश्च चैत्रत्वादिः सूर्यक्रियाऽपि तत्कालोत्तरकालीनान्यत्वेन विशेषणीया नातोऽशीतिवर्षजीविस्थविरचैत्रापेक्षया शतवर्षजीविपुत्रमैत्रे परत्वोत्पत्तिः अथवा सूर्यपरिस्पन्दपूर्वोत्पन्नत्वं विप्रकर्षः तदनन्तरोत्पन्नत्वं संनिकर्षः युवचैत्राद्युत्पत्त्यधिकरणं यः सूर्यस्पन्दस्तत्पूर्वोत्पन्नत्वं स्थविरमैत्रादौ वर्तते इति स्थविरे परत्वम् स्थविरमैत्राद्युत्पत्त्यधिकरणसूर्यस्पन्दानन्तरोत्पन्नत्वं युवचैत्रादावस्तीति तत्रापरत्वं जायते अचेतने कालिकपरत्वापरत्वव्यवहाराभावे तु प्राणित्वे सतीति विशेषणं देयम् तत्तच्छरीरमादायातिप्रसङ्गस्तु जातिविशेषनिवेशेन वारणीय इति संक्षेपः । द्विविधयोः परत्वापरत्वयोर्नाशकोऽपेक्षाबुद्धिनाश इति मुक्तावलीकारः उपस्कारे तु त्रिविधकारणनाशस्यैव परत्वापरत्वनाशकत्वमुक्तमिति ॥

cognition of inherence in a substratum of more or less conjunction with the sun The efficient cause, therefore, of posteriority in space is the cognition of the substratum of more numerous conjunctions with the sun, the non coinherent cause is conjunction of space in the body which is the substratum of this quality of posteriority, and the co inherent cause is the matter which is the object of such cognition The efficient cause of priority in space is the cognition of a substratum of fewer conjunctions of the sun, its co inherent cause is the body which is the object of such a cognition, the non coinherent cause is conjunction of space in such matter For there is such a practical assurance as that to one living at Páṭaliputra, Kásí is nearer than Prayaga, and Prayaga further than Kasi The object of this cognition, posteriority, arises in reference to Prayaga, because Prayága is there cognised as the site of more numerous conjunctions with the sun, and the priority in reference to Kásí arises from its being known that Kásí is the site of less numerous conjunctions with the sun The notion and expression of prior and posterior is produced by two bodies occupying the same time, that is by two bodies which have one time to conjoin them contiguous and remote, that is cognised as substrata of more or less numerous revolutions of the sun For there arise such cognitions and expressions as that an old man is posterior in relation to a young man and a young man prior in relation to an old man The old man is the co inherent cause of the posteriority which is the object of this cognition, the non-coinherent cause is conjunction with a greater time, the efficient cause is the cognition of the substratum of more numerous revolutions of the sun The young man is the co inherent cause of priority, the non-coinherent cause is the conjunction of the body of the young man with a great time the efficient cause is the cognition of the young man as the substratum of less numerous revolutions of the sun than those inherent in the old man. Although bodies differ according to childhood, youth, and

tion of contiguity and remoteness in priority and posteriority in space, where there is destruction of the conjunction of the body with space The three cases therefore *of destruction of temporal priority* and posteriority, from destruction of the co inherent cause, from destruction of the relative cognition and by both conjointly, are to *be inferred according to the analogy of the preceding* U

[1] The notion and expression of prior and posterior is produced by two bodies occupying the same space that is, having the same space *as their site and contiguous or remote, that is objects of a*

[1] एका दिक् आधारतया ययोस्तावेकदिक्कौ मूर्त्तौ ताभ्यां मूर्त्ताभ्यां सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्यां बहुतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वाल्पतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानविषयाभ्यां परमपरञ्चेति व्यवहारो जायते इत्यर्थः । तथाच दैशिकपरत्वं प्रति बहुतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणं तदाश्रये मूर्त्ते दिक्संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणं तादृशज्ञानविषयो मूर्त्तः समवायिकारणम् दैशिकापरत्वस्याल्पतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणं तद्विषयो मूर्त्तः समवायिकारणं तादृशमूर्त्ते दिक्संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणमिति भवति हि पाटलिपुत्रस्य काशीमपेक्ष्य प्रयागः परः प्रयागमपेक्ष्य काश्यपरेति व्यवहारः तद्विषयं परत्वं प्रयागे उत्पद्यते तत्र बहुतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वेन तस्य ज्ञातत्वात् । काश्याञ्चापरत्वं जायते अल्पतरसूर्यसंयोगाश्रयत्वेन तस्या ज्ञातत्वात् एककालाभ्यामिति एकः कालः संयोगितया ययोः पिण्डयोस्ताभ्यामेककालाभ्यां पिण्डाभ्यां सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टाभ्याम् । अल्पतरतपनपरिस्पन्दबहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दाश्रयतया ज्ञाताभ्यां परमपरञ्चेति व्यवहारो भवति भवति हि युवानमपेक्ष्य स्थविरः परः स्थविरमपेक्ष्य युवाऽपर इत्यादिको व्यवहारस्तद्विषयस्य परत्वस्य समवायिकारणं स्थविरः तत्र महाकालस्य संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् । बहुतरसूर्यक्रियाश्रयत्वज्ञानं निमित्तकारणम् अपरत्वस्य च युवा समवायिकारणम् युवशरीरमहाकालयोः संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् स्थविराश्रिततपनस्पन्दापेक्षयाऽल्पतरतपनस्पन्दाश्रयत्वेन यूनो ज्ञानं निमित्तकारणम् यद्यपि शरीराणां बाल्ययौवनवार्द्धक्यभेदेन भिन्नत्वात् युवस्थविरगततपनपरिस्पन्दानां वैपरीत्यमपि सम्भवति तथापि बहुतरतपनपरिस्पन्दसमानाधिकरणवैजात्यवत्त्वज्ञानमेव स्थविरे कालिकपरत्वस्य कारणम् अल्पतरतपनस्पन्दसमानाधिकरणवैजात्यज्ञानञ्च यून्यपरत्वस्य कारणमिति नच घटाद्यपेक्षया परमाणोरपि बहुतरसूर्यक्रियासमानाधिकरणचिर्यीत्वादिजातिमत्त्वज्ञानात् परत्वं कथं नोत्पद्यते इति वाच्यं बहुतरसूर्यक्रियासमानाधिकरणैककालीनद्रव्यावृत्तिजातिमत्त्वस्य विवक्षितत्वात् तादृशजातिश्च चैत्रत्वादिः सूर्यक्रियाऽपि तत्कालान्तरकालीनान्यत्वेन विशेषणीया नातोऽव्याप्तिर्यज्ञोऽपिस्थविरचैत्रापेक्षया शतवर्षजीवियुवमैत्रे परत्वोत्पत्तिः अथवा सूर्यपरिस्पन्दपूर्वोत्पन्नत्वं विप्रकर्षः तदनन्तरोत्पन्नत्वं सन्निकर्षः युवचैत्राद्युत्पत्त्यधिकरणं यः सूर्यस्पन्दस्तत्पूर्वोत्पन्नत्वं स्थविरमैत्रादौ वर्त्तते इति स्थविरे परत्वम् स्थविरमैत्राद्युत्पत्त्यधिकरणसूर्यस्पन्दानन्तरोत्पन्नत्वं युवचैत्रादावस्तीति तत्रापरत्वं जायते अचेतने कालिकपरत्वापरत्वव्यवहाराभावे तु प्राणित्वे सतीति विशेषणं देयम् तत्तच्छरीरमादायातिप्रसङ्गस्तु जातिविशेषनिवेशेन वारणीय इति सङ्क्षेपः । द्विविधयोः परत्वापरत्वयोर्नाशकोऽपेक्षाबुद्धिनाश इति मुक्तावलीकारः उपस्कारे तु त्रिविधकारणनाशस्यैव परत्वापरत्वनाशकत्वमुक्तमिति ॥

cognition of inherence in a substratum of more or less conjunction with the sun The efficient cause therefore of posteriority in space is the cognition of the substratum of more numerous conjunctions with the sun, the non coinherent cause is conjunction of space in the body which is the substratum of this quality of posteriority, and the co inherent cause is the matter which is the object of such cognition The efficient cause of priority in space is the cognition of a substratum of fewer conjunctions of the sun, its co inherent cause is the body which is the object of such a cognition, the non coinherent cause is conjunction of space in such matter For there is such a practical assurance as that to one living at Paṭaliputra Kaśi is nearer than Prayága and Prayaga further than Kasi The object of this cognition, posteriority arises in reference to Prayaga because Prayaga is there cognised as the site of more numerous conjunctions with the sun, and the priority in reference to Kaśi arises from its being known that Káśi is the site of less numerous conjunctions with the sun The notion and expression of prior and posterior is produced *by two bodies occupying the same time that is by two bodies* which have one time to conjoin them contiguous and remote that is cognised as substrata of more or less numerous revolutions of the sun For there arise such cognitions and expressions as that an old man is posterior in relation to a young man and a young man prior in relation to an old man The old man is the co inherent cause of the posteriority which is the object of this cognition, the non-coinherent cause is conjunction with a greater time, the efficient cause is the cognition of the substratum of more numerous revolutions of the sun The young man is the co inherent cause of priority, the non coinherent cause is the conjunction of the body of the young man with a great time the efficient cause is the cognition of the young man as the substratum of less numerous revolutions of the sun than those inherent in the old man. Although bodies differ according to childhood, youth and

old age and there is consequently possible therein the contrariety of the revolutions of the sun existent in the old man and the young, yet it *is the cognition of heterogeneity in the common* substratum of more numerous conjunctions with the sun that is the cause of temporal posteriority in the old man, and the cognition of heterogeneity in the substratum of less numerous conjunctions with the sun that is the cause of priority in the youth. It *cannot therefore be asked in objection, why posteriority is not* produced in an atom as compared with a water pot &c inasmuch as there is cognised in the atom the possession of the universal nature terrestriality &c the common substratum of more numerous movements of the sun. For by this is meant possession of a universal nature *non-existent in two contemporaneous common sub*strata of more numerous movements of the sun. Such a universal nature is the being Chaitra &c. The solar motion is also to be characterised as other than that which is subsequent to that time. Hence it is that there is not produced posteriority in Maitra as a youth a hundred years old as compared with Chaitra an old man of eighty. Or remoteness may be defined as production prior to revolutions of the sun, and contiguity as production subsequent thereto. Production prior to the revolution of the sun which *was the* substratum *of the production (i e year of the* birth) of Chaitra the young man &c exists in the old man Maitra &c. and therefore there is priority in the senior. Production subsequent to the revolution of the sun which was the *substratum of the production of Maitra the senior* exists in Chaitra the junior &c, and posteriority is therefore produced in him. Inasmuch as there is in the unsentient non existence of the cognition of priority and posteriority in time we must add to the definition the condition of there being sentiency. *Undue width in* the definition when we consider such and such a particular body is to be prevented by the addition of a certain universality. It is to be observed that the author of the Muktávali states that the de-

struction of the cognition of relativity is destructive of priority and posteriority in both their forms that is of both local and temporal priority and posteriority while in the Upaskara it is laid down that it is the destruction of their three-fold causes that is destructive of priority and posteriority V

कारणपरत्वात् कारणापरत्वाच्च ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 [Priority and posteriority result] from posteriority of the cause and from priority of the cause

[1] Time is the cause of priority and posteriority There is here stated by indication conjunction with time as the non coinherent cause of posteriority and conjunction with time as the non-coinherent cause of priority in relation to the priority and posteriority of the time Otherwise there would be no connection between the words of the aphorism, for priority and posteriority could not be produced merely by priority and posteriority The terms priority and posteriority have therefore by implication the meaning of conjunction with time productive thereof U

परत्वापरत्वयोः परत्वापरत्वाभावो ऽणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्यां व्याख्यातः ॥ २३ ॥

Aph 23 The non existence of priority and posteriority in priority and posteriority, is explained by minuteness and greatness

कर्मभिः कर्माणि ॥ २४ ॥

Aph 24 Actions [are void] of actions

गुणैर्गुणाः ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 Qualities [are void] of qualities

---

[1] परत्वापरत्वयोः कारणं कालस्तस्य परत्वापरत्वे परत्वासमवायिकारणकालसंयोगोऽपरत्वासमवायिकारणकालसंयोगश्च लक्षणयोक्तः अन्यथाऽनन्वयापत्तेः नहि परत्वापरत्वाभ्यामेव परत्वापरत्वे उत्पद्येते तस्मात् परत्वापरत्वपदे तदुत्पादककालसंयोगपरे लक्षणया ॥

old age, and there is consequently possible therein the contrariety of the revolutions of the sun existent in the old man and the young, yet it is the cognition of heterogeneity in the common *substratum of more numerous conjunctions with the sun, that is* the cause of temporal posteriority in the old man, and the cognition of heterogeneity in the substratum of less numerous conjunctions with the sun, that is the cause of priority in the youth It cannot, therefore, be asked in objection, why posteriority is not produced in an atom, as compared with a water pot &c, inasmuch as there is cognised in the atom the possession of the universal nature terrestriality &c, the common substratum of more numerous movements of the sun For by this is meant possession of a universal nature *non-existent in two contemporaneous common* substrata of more numerous movements of the sun Such a universal nature is the being Chaitra, &c, The solar motion is also to be characterised as other than that which is subsequent to that time *Hence it is that there is not produced posteriority in Maitra* as a youth a hundred years old as compared with Chaitra an old man of eighty Or remoteness may be defined as production prior to revolutions of the sun, and contiguity as production subsequent *thereto Production prior to the revolution of the sun* which was the substratum of the production (i e year of the birth) of Chaitra the young man &c exists in the old man Maitra &c and therefore there is priority in the senior Production *subsequent to the revolution of the sun which was the* substratum of the production of Maitrá the senior exists in Cháitra the junior &c., and posteriority is therefore produced in him Inasmuch as there is in the unsentient non existence of the cognition *of priority and posteriority in time we must add to the definition* the condition of there being sentiency Undue width in the definition when we consider such and such a particular body is to be prevented by the addition of a certain universality It is to be observed that the author of the Muktavali states that the de-

struction of the cognition of relativity is destructive of priority and posteriority in both their forms that is, of both local and temporal priority and posteriority, while in the Upaskára it is laid down that it is the destruction of their *three-fold* causes that is destructive of priority and posteriority V

कारणपरत्वात् कारणापरत्वाच्च ॥ २२ ॥

Aph 22 [Priority and posteriority result] from posteriority of the cause, and from priority of the cause

[1] Time is the cause of priority and posteriority There is here stated by indication conjunction with time as the non coinherent cause of posteriority, and conjunction with time as the non-coinherent cause of priority in relation to the priority and posteriority of the time Otherwise there would be no connection between the words of the aphorism, for priority and posteriority could not be produced merely by priority and posteriority The terms priority and posteriority have, therefore by implication, the meaning of conjunction with time productive thereof U

परत्वापरत्वयोः परत्वापरत्वाभावोऽणुत्वमहत्त्वाभ्यां व्याख्यातः ॥ २३ ॥

Aph 23 The non existence of priority and posteriority in priority and posteriority, is explained by minuteness and greatness

कर्मभिः कर्माणि ॥ २४ ॥

Aph 24 Actions [are void] of actions

गुणैर्गुणाः ॥ २५ ॥

Aph 25 Qualities [are void] of qualities

---

[1] परत्वापरत्वयोः कारणं कालस्तस्य परत्वापरत्वे परत्वासमवायिकारणकालसंयोगोऽपरत्वासमवायिकारणकालसंयोगश्च लक्षणयोक्त अन्यथाऽनन्वयापत्ते नहि परत्वापरत्वाभ्यामेव परत्वापरत्वे उत्पद्येते तस्मात् परत्वापरत्वपदयोस्तदुत्पादककालसंयोगपर लक्षणया ॥

इहेदमिति यतः कार्यकारणयोः स समवायः ॥ २६ ॥

Aph 26 That is co-inherence by virtue of which it may be said of cause and effect that the one is in the other.

[1] The investigation of co-inherence is described, though to the neg-

---

[1] परत्वापरत्वादीनां मूर्तमात्रसमवेतत्वमुक्तं ज्ञानसुखादीनामात्मसमवेतत्वं तत्र समवाय एव कइति जिज्ञासामनुरुध्य उद्देशक्रमप्राप्ताया अपि तद्धनाम् समवायपरीक्षामाह । कार्यकारणयोरित्युपलक्षणम् अकार्यकारणयोरित्यपि द्रष्टव्यं तदुक्तं पदार्थप्रदेशाख्ये प्रकरणे अयुतसिद्धानामाधार्याधारभूतानां यः सम्बन्ध इहेति प्रत्ययहेतुः स समवाय इति अयुतयोरविद्यमानत्वमयुतसिद्धिः इह कुण्डे दधि इह कुण्डे बदराणीतिवत् इह तन्तुषु पट इह वीरणेषु कट इह द्रव्ये द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि इह गवि गोत्वम् इहात्मनि ज्ञानम् इहाकाशे शब्द इतीहबुद्धिरुत्पद्यमाना न विना सम्बन्धमुत्पत्तुमर्हति तेनानुमीयतेऽस्ति कश्चित् सम्बन्धः अविचारितो संयोग एव अन्यतरकर्मादीनां तदुत्पादकानामभावात् विभागपर्यवसानाभावाच्च सम्बन्धिनामयुतसिद्धत्वाच्च नियताधिकरणतयैवोपलब्धत्वात् अवयवत्वादेरुत्पत्त्याश्रितत्वाच्च । नन्वेकश्चेत्समवायस्तदा द्रव्यत्वादीनां सङ्करप्रसङ्गः कर्मत्वादिसमवायस्य द्रव्ये सम्भवात् मैवम् आधाराधेयनियमादेवासङ्करो यद्यपि य एव द्रव्यत्वसमवायः स एव गुणत्वकर्मत्वादीनामपि तथापि तेषां द्रव्यमाधारस्तत्र तेषामप्रतीतेः द्रव्येष्वेव सादृश्यं प्रतीयते गुणेष्वेव गुणत्वं कर्मस्वेव कर्मत्वं तदन्वयव्यतिरेकमनुदर्शनादेव नियमः अन्यथा कुण्डदध्नोः संयोगाविशेषेऽपि कुण्डमेवाधारो न दधीत्याधाराधेयभावनियमस्तथा व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकशक्तिभेदादेवात्रापि नियम उपपत्स्यते नहि द्रव्येण द्रव्यत्ववत् कर्मत्वमप्यभिव्यज्यते तदुक्तम् संविदेव हि भगवती वस्तूपगमे नः शरणम् इति तथाधारत्वे धीर्न विपरीता सम्बन्धोऽस्ति नहि भवति द्रव्यं कर्मेति यथा भवति घटे तन्त्वत्र इति तेन धर्मो रूपसमवायोऽपि धर्मो रूपमित्याधारता न धर्मिणः प्रतीयते तस्मात्स्वभावशक्तिरेव सर्वत्र नियामिका न चायं नित्यस्वकारणत्वात् समवायिकारणादुत्पत्तिनियमः तदनुत्पत्तेः न निमित्तमप्यथापि नो तथा च समवायस्य समवायिकारणं यत् स्यात् तत् समवायान्तरेण तेनैव तत्समवायेन वा न तावदाद्यः अनवस्थापातात् न द्वितीयः नहि स एव स समवायः स्वेनैव समवायः सम्भवतीत्यात्माश्रयात् तन्तुषु पटसमवायः पटे रूपसमवायइति प्रतीतिः कथमिति चेन स्वरूपसम्बन्धेन समवायाभ्युपगमे ज्ञानादिनित्यत्वापातात् सर्वोऽपि घटरूपवत्त्वधी रूपस्य स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनैव स्यात् किं समवायेनेति चेत् तदतिरिक्तसम्बन्धे बाधकाभावात् सर्वोऽपि भूतले घटाभाव इत्यत्रापि समवायः सम्बन्धान्तरं वा स्यादिति चेत् स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनैव तदुपपत्तेः अन्यथा घटाभावाभावादेरभावयोर्नित्ययोरनेकसमवेतयोः सामान्यत्वापत्तेः प्रध्वंसस्य च समवेतकार्यत्वेन विनाशित्वापत्तेः प्रागभावस्य च समवेतानुत्पन्नकार्यस्य विनाशित्वापत्तेश्च नच भावत्वं तत्र तत्त्वम् भावान्तरभावत्वात् अभावेऽप्येव वैशिष्ट्याख्यं सम्बन्धान्तरमिति भाट्टाः तत्र यदि सर्वाभावस्थले नानैकांश वैशिष्ट्यं तदा घटवत्यपि घटाभावप्रत्ययप्रसङ्गः [illegible] त्वात् घट एव तत्र घटाभावोऽपि विशेष्यक इति चेत् वैशिष्ट्यसम्बन्धेन प्रतियोगिकाभावस्य तत्र सत्त्वात् तथाच घटाभाव एव साहचर्यं येन न तत्र घटाभावाभिव्यक्ति घटापसारणानन्तरं तत्रैव घटाभावप्रतीतिः तत्सादिरूपनाशानन्तरं कथं न रूपनाशप्रत्ययः समवायस्य नित्यत्वादेकत्वाच्चेति तत् रूपनाशेन तदवच्छिन्नसमवायनिवृत्तेः" ॥

lect of thought which is the next subject in order, in favour of the desire of the student to know what co inherence is it having been stated that priority and posteriority co inhere in objects only and that knowledge pleasure &c co inhere in the soul. The words cause and effect have an implicative force and are to be considered to apply also to non cause and non effect, as it has been stated in the section entitled the Locality of the Categories that the relation of unconjoined objects subsistent and inherent is co inherence The cause of the cognition of the here non unconnectedness is the non existence of two unconjoined objects Inasmuch as the thought of clarified butter here present in the bowl, as that of jujubes here present in the bowl of cloth here present in the threads, of grass here in the blades, of substance quality and action here in substance of the essence of a cow here in the cow, of cognition here in the soul of sound here in the ether,— this thought of the here which is thus produced cannot be produced without some connection it is inferred that there is some connection This connection is not mere conjunction for the actions &c of one only of the two objects cannot produce it its existence does not terminate in disjunction connected objects may be non conjunctly effected they must be conceived to have a determinate substratum, it is not perceptible and it is one and eternal If it be objected that if co inherence be one it follows that there is a confusion with regard to substantiality inasmuch as the essence of action &c may co inhere as well as the essence of substance in substance, we reply that it is not so According to the relation of subsistence and inherence there can be no confusion For though that co inherence which is the co inherence of the essence of substance, be the co inherence of the essences of quality, action &c yet substance is not the substratum of these latter essences inasmuch as they are not manifested in substance The essence of substances or substantiality appears only in substances, the essence of qualities only in qualities, the essence of actions only in ac

इहेदमिति यतः कार्यकारणयोः स समवायः ॥ २६ ॥

Aph 26 That is co inherence by virtue of which it may be said of cause and effect that the one is in the other.

[1] The investigation of co-inherence is described, though to the neg-

---

[1] पाच्यापच्यादीनां मूर्तमात्रसमवेतत्वमुक्तं ज्ञानसुखादीनामात्मसमवेतत्वं तत्र समवाय एव करति निरूपयितुमामनुबध्य बुद्ध्यादेरसमवायाभावा अपि तद्वत्त्वात् समवायपरीक्षामाह । कार्यकारणयोरित्युपलक्षणम् अकार्यकारणयोरित्यपि द्रष्टव्यं तदुक्तं पदार्थप्रदेशाख्ये प्रकरणे अयुतसिद्धानामाधार्याधारभूतानां यः सम्बन्ध इहेति प्रत्ययहेतुः स समवायः इति सम्बन्धयोर्विद्यमानत्वमयुतसिद्धिः इह कुण्डे दधि इह कुण्डे बदराणीतिवत् इह तन्तुषु पट इह वीरणेषु कट इह द्रव्ये द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि इह गवि गोत्वम् इहात्मनि ज्ञानम् इहाकाशे शब्द इतीयबुद्धिरुत्पद्यमाना न विना सम्बन्धमुत्पत्तुमर्हतीति तेनानुमीयतेऽस्ति कश्चित् सम्बन्धः परिचायकः संयोग एव कस्मात् तदेकमादीना तद्दुत्पाद्यकानामभावात् विभागपर्यन्तानाभावाच्च सम्बन्धिनामयुतसिद्धत्वाच्च नियताधिकरणतयैवाचेयत्वात् अनन्यत्वादेरत्याविद्यत्वाच्च । ननु एकत्वेन समवायस्तदा द्रव्यत्वादीनां सङ्करप्रसङ्गः कर्मत्वादिसमवायस्य द्रव्ये समवायात् मैवम् आधाराधेयनियमादेवासङ्करो यद्यपि च एव द्रव्यत्वसमवायः स एव गुणत्वकर्मत्वादीनामपि तथापि तेषां द्रव्यमाधारस्तत्र तेषामप्रतीतेः द्रव्येष्वेव सत्त्वं प्रतीयते गुणेष्वेव गुणत्वं कर्मस्वेव कर्मत्वं तत्त्वन्यत्वेऽन्वयव्यतिरेकदर्शनादेव नियमः अन्यथा कुण्डदधिसंयोगाविशेषेऽपि कुण्डमेवाधारो न दधीत्याधाराधेयभावनियमस्तथा व्यङ्ग्यव्यञ्जकशक्तिभेदादेवापि नियम उपपत्स्यते नहि द्रव्येण द्रव्यत्वमेव कर्मत्वाद्यप्यभिव्यज्यते तदुक्तम् सत्येव हि सम्बन्धे यत्किमपि नः साधनम् इति तदाधारत्वं प्रति विपरीता सम्बन्धोऽस्ति नहि भवति द्रव्यं धर्मीति यथा भवति पटे तन्तव इति तेन वायौ रूपसमवायेऽपि वायौ रूपमित्याधारता न वायोः प्रतीयते एतस्मात्स्वभावशक्तिरेव सर्वत्र नियामिका स चाय नित्यः कारणकत्वात् समवायिकारणादुत्पत्तिनियमः तदनुत्पत्ते च निमित्तासमवायिनां तथाच समवायस्य समवायिकारणं यत् स्यात् तत् समवायान्तरेण तेनैव समवायेन वा न तावदाद्यः अनवस्थापातात् न द्वितीयः नहि स एव स समवाय स्वेनैव समवायः सम्भवतीत्यात्माश्रयात् तन्तुषु पटसमवायः पटे रूपसमवाय इति प्रतीतिः कथमिति चेत् स्वरूपसम्बन्धेन समवायान्तराङ्गीकारेऽनवस्थापातात् तर्हि पटरूपमित्यपि प्रत्यय स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनैव स्यात् किं समवायेनेति चेन्न तदतिरिक्तसम्बन्धे बाधकाभावात् तर्हि भूतले घटाभाव इत्यत्रापि समवायः सम्बन्धान्तरं वा स्यादिति चेन्न स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनैव तदुपपत्तेः अन्यथा घटात्यन्ताभावान्योन्याभावयोर्नित्ययोरनेकसमवेतयोः सामान्यत्वापत्तेः प्रध्वंसस्य च समवेतकार्यत्वेन विनाशित्वापत्तेः प्रागभावस्य च समवेतानुत्पन्नत्वेनाविनाशित्वापत्तेश्च नच भावत्वं तत्र तन्त्रम् भावत्वस्याप्रमाणत्वात् अभावस्यैव वैशिष्ट्याख्यं सम्बन्धान्तरमिति भाट्टाः तत्र यदि सर्वाभावव्यक्तीनामेकमेव वैशिष्ट्यं तदा घटवत्यपि घटाभाववत्ताप्रसङ्गः घटाभाववैशिष्ट्यस्यैव घटाभाववैशिष्ट्यत्वात् घट एव तत्र घटाभावधीप्रतिबन्धक इति चेन्न वैशिष्ट्यसम्बन्धेन प्रतिबन्धकाभावस्य तत्र सत्त्वात् नचाप्यस्याभाव एव तादृशो येन न तत्र घटाभावाभिव्यक्तिः घटापसारणानन्तरं तत्रैव घटाभावप्रतीतिः तथाविधरूपनाशानन्तरं कथं न रूपवत्ताप्रत्ययः समवायस्य नित्यत्वादेकत्वाच्चेतिवत् रूपनाशादेव तदप्रतीतेरुपपत्ते. समवायप्रतिबन्धः ॥

lect of thought which is the next subject in order, in favour of the desire of the student to know what co inherence is it having been stated that priority and posteriority co inhere in objects only, and that knowledge, pleasure &c co inhere in the soul The words cause and effect have an implicative force, and are to be considered to apply also to non cause and non-effect, as it has been stated in the *section entitled the Locality of the Categories, that the* relation of unconjoined objects subsistent and inherent is co-inherence The cause of the cognition of the here non-unconnectedness, is the non-existence of two unconjoined objects Inasmuch as the thought of clarified butter here present in the bowl, as that of jujubes *here present in* the bowl, of cloth here present in the threads, of grass here in the blades, of substance, quality, and action here in substance, of the essence of a cow here in the cow, of cognition here in the soul, of sound here in the ether,—this thought of the here which is thus produced, cannot be produced without some connection, it is inferred that there is some connection *This connection is not mere conjunction for the actions &c of one only of the two objects cannot produce it, its exis*tence does not terminate in disjunction, connected objects may be non conjunctly effected they must be conceived to have a determinate substratum, it is not perceptible, and it is one, and eternal If it be objected that if co-inherence be one it follows that there is a confusion with regard to substantiality inasmuch as the essence of action &c may co inhere as well as *the essence of substance in* substance, *we reply that it is not so According to the relation of* subsistence and inherence, there can be no confusion For though that co-inherence which is the co inherence of the essence of substance, be the co inherence of the essences of quality, action &c, yet substance is not the substratum of these latter essences inasmuch as they are not manifested in substance The essence of substances or substantiality, appears only in substances, the essence of qualities, *only in* qualities, the essence of *actions only in* ac-

tions, and nowhere else, accordingly *from the observation of this* concomitance and its negation, there results a determination of the relation of subsistence and inherence As there being an ordinary conjunction between a vessel and clarified butter, it is the vessel which is the substratum or receptacle not the clarified butter, and therefore there is a determination the relation of containing and contained, so this limitation is here possible only as a consequence of the difference of the power of manifesting and of being manifested. For the essence of action &c is not manifested by substance as the essence of substance is Hence it has been said, All powerful consciousness is our resource in the apprehension of things For there is no contradictory intuition in relation to the nature of substrata, since there arises no intuition that substance becomes action, or that the threads are in the cloth, nor in the case of air does there appear the nature of a substratum because in the co inherence with colour, colour is in air It is therefore natural power which in every instance determines the relation between the substratum and that which inheres in it. This same co inherence is, eternal since it has no cause, for the co inherent cause is the condition of the production of existences and the non-coinherent and and efficient causes are subsidiary thereto If, moreover there were a co-inherent cause of co inherence this must exist in virtue of another co inherence or of same co-inherence It is not the former for there would thus emerge a regress to infinity It is not the latter, for this same co inherence could not co inhere with *itself, for thus there would be constantly recurring co-inherence.*

If we be asked how there arises the cognition of the co-inherence of the cloth in the threads and of the colour in the cloth, we reply that it is by an essential connection, for on the hypothesis of a second co inherence there would be a regress to infinity If it be objected In that case the cognition of the locally present also, as that there is here the colour of the cloth, must also be by essential connection —we reply that it is not so, there being a non exis-

tence which renders a further connection impossible If then, it be objected In the cognition that there is here on this spot non existence of a water pot there is a co inherence or other connection —we reply that it is not so for this may be produced by essential connection, for on the contrary supposition there would follow a universality of the absolute and reciprocal non existences of the water pot, eternal, and co inherent in a plurality of objects and emergent non-existence might be destructive as being a co inherent effect, and antecedent non existence might be destructive as being not produced by the co inherent The nature of existence is not in this case the condition for possibility belongs to the nature of existence

The Bháṭṭas maintain that there is in non existence another connection called possession of attributes or predicates On this hypothesis did possession of attributes belong to all individual non-existences it would follow that we should cognise non existence of a water pot even where a water pot existed, and the possession of the character of non-existence as a water pot might exist merely in virtue of the possession of the character of non existence as a piece of cloth. If it be replied that the water pot in this case prevents the thought of the non existence of the water pot, it may be replied that there is in this case non existence of the preventive by reason of the connection of possession of the attributes Nor is the nature of the substratum such that there should not be there a manifestation of the non existence of the water pot, for after the water pot has been removed there appears in this substratum that is in the place where the water pot had stood, the non existence of the water pot

If it be objected How is it that after the destruction of colour, on your hypothesis there is not a cognition of the coloured inasmuch as co inherence is eternal and one?—we reply that the non-appearance of the coloured is possible in consequence of the destruction of colour only U

[1] The connection of cause and effect, of part and whole, wherefrom there results the cognition that such a thing is in such a place, is co inherence For a cognition such as those of the cloth in the threads, the water pot in its halves, the grass in its blades, has for its object the existence of the threads &c. in the cloth &c. This existence is determined by a special kind of connection, for else it would follow that there might be such cognitions as of the water pot in the threads, the existence of the threads &c, residing by a temporal connection in the water-pot, &c. Connection, therefore, determining existence in a given mode, is co-inherence, for between whole and part conjunction is impossible The words cause and effect have an implicative power, and it is therefore to be held that, that also which determines the relation of action and agent, of essence and individual, of eternal substance and particular object, and of containing and contained is co-inherence The proof of co inherence is determinate cognition the object of which is the relation of character and characterised or predicate and subject. From determinate cognition such as of a man with a staff there results an inference In this inference conjunction &c., being

---

[1] कार्यकारणयोरवयवावयविनोर्यत सम्बन्धात् इहेदमिति प्रत्यय स समवाय तन्तुषु पटः कपालेषु घट वीरणेषु कटइत्यादिप्रत्ययो हि पटादौ तन्त्वादिवृत्तित्व विषयी करोति तच्च वृत्तित्व सम्बन्धविशेषनियन्त्रितमेवान्यथा तन्तुषु घट इत्यादिप्रतीति प्रसङ्गात् कालिकेन तन्त्वादिवृत्तित्वस्य घटादौ सत्वात इत्यञ्च तादृशवृत्तितानियामक सम्बन्ध समवाय एव अवयवावयविनो संयोगासम्भवात कार्यकारणयोरित्युपलक्षण गुणगुणिनो क्रियाक्रियावतोर्जातिव्यक्त्योर्नित्यद्रव्यविशेषपदार्थयोश्चाधाराधेयभावनियामकोऽपि समवाय एवेति मन्तव्यम् । समवाये प्रमाणन्तु गुणक्रियादिविशिष्टबुद्धिर्विशेषणविशेष्यसम्बन्धविषया विशिष्टबुद्धित्वाद्दण्डी पुरुष इति विशिष्टबुद्धिवदित्यनुमान तत्र च संयोगादिबाधात समवायसिद्धि नच स्वरूपसम्बन्धेनार्थान्तरमनन्तस्वरूपाणा सम्बन्धत्वाभ्युपगमे गौरवात नचैवमभावस्याप्यनया रीत्या सम्बन्धान्तर सिद्धेरिति वाच्य यतोऽभावसम्बन्धस्य न नित्यत्वसम्भवस्तथा सति भूतले घटानयनानन्तरमपि घटाभावबुद्धिप्रसङ्गात् घटाभावस्य तत्सम्बन्धस्य च नित्यत्वात नाप्यभावस्य सम्बन्धान्तरमनित्यमङ्गीकर्तु शक्यते एकस्मिन्नेव भूतले सहस्रधा घटानयनापसारणादौ सम्बन्धसहस्रकल्पनापत्तेस्तस्माद्घटापसरणकालीनभूतलादिस्वरूप एव घटाभावसम्बन्ध स्वीकरणीय घटकालस्य सम्बन्धाघटकतया घटकाले न घटात्यन्ताभावप्रतीति इत्यञ्च भूतलादौ घटाद्यभावस्य स्वरूपसम्बन्धस्वीकारस्यावश्यकत्वेनाभावान्तरस्थलेऽपि स्वरूपस्यैव सम्बन्धत्वमभावप्रत्ययानामेकविधसम्बन्धावगाहित्वस्यानुभवसिद्धत्वादिति ॥

impossible, there is given a proof of co inherence It cannot be maintained that by essential connection we are to understand a distinct entity there being a complexity involved in the conception of a connection of endless essential forms, and that according to this method there could not be proved a distinct connection of non-existence. For it is impossible that the connection of non existence should be eternal, as that of co-inherence is for were this the case, it would follow that after a water pot had been brought to a spot where one had not previously stood there would be the cognition of the non existence of the water pot in consequence of the eternity of the non-existence of the water pot and of its conection. Nor can it be admitted that there belongs another non eternal connection to non-existence, for we should then have to imagine, in the case of a water pot being brought and taken away a thousand times to and from a spot, a thousand connections We must therefore maintain that the connection of non-existence of the water pot belongs to the essential form of the spot at the time the water pot is removed Inasmuch as the time when the water pot is there does not effect this connection at the time the water pot is there there is no cognition of the absolute non existence of the water pot. Thus it being necessary to allow an essential connection of non-existence of the water pot on the ground &c there must in the case of other non-existence be a connection with the essential form, for it is evinced by experience that the cognitions of non-existences are conversant about one uniform kind of connection V

द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वप्रतिषेधो भावेन व्याख्यात ॥ २७ ॥

Aph 27 The negation of the essence of substance and quality is explained by existence

[1] It may be urged Let co inherence be included in substance,

[1] ननु समवायो द्रव्ये गुणादिषु चान्तर्भवतु किन्तस्यातिरिक्तपदार्थत्वकल्पनेनेत्यत आह । भावेन सत्तया द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वप्रतिषेधो द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वाभावो व्याख्यातः उक्तः तथा च सत्ता यथा द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वशून्या विलक्षणबुद्धिविषयत्वात् समवायोऽपि विलक्षणबुद्धिविषयत्वात् द्रव्यत्वादिमानित्यर्थः एवमुपलक्षणं कर्मत्वादिप्रतिषेधोऽपि बोध्यः ॥

or in quality &c., why should it be assumed to be an additional category? In reply it is stated that the negation, that is, the non-*existence of the essence of substance and quality is explained, that is,* is declared by existence or being As, therefore, existence is void of the essence of substance and of quality as being the object of a differently characterised cognition, so also co-inherence, as being the object of a differently characterised cognition does not possess the character of substance, &c. There is here an indication, the negation of the essence of action &c requiring to be understood V

तत्त्वं भावेन ॥ २८ ॥

Aph 28 Its reality [is explained] by existence

[1] The words is explained are to be supplied Its reality, that is its unity, is explained by existence, that is by being *For as it* is one existence that in all cases excites the cognition of the existent, so is there one co-inherence that in all cases excites the cognition of the co-inherent, inasmuch as there is no difference in the marks or characters by which its existence is inferred, and there is non existence of a particular mark For we reckon no particular mark or differentiating character, by which we should apprehend variety of co-inherences. Hence it is eternal, inasmuch as non eternity is inapplicable to that which is indivisible, though there be a division according to space, time &c, as is the case with existence *It may be objected that if thus co-inherence be merely a* conjunction, there may be disjunction of threads and cloth or of the cloth and its colour This is not the case, since in the absence of

---

[1] *व्याख्यातमितिशेषः तत्त्वमेकत्वं भावेन सत्तया व्याख्यातम यथैका सत्ता सर्वत्र* सद्बुद्धिप्रवर्त्तिका तथैक एव समवायः सर्वत्र समवेतबुद्धिप्रवर्त्तकः स्वलिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेष लिङ्गाभावाच्च नहि समवायस्य विशेषलिङ्गं भेदकं लिङ्गमाकलयामो येन नानात्वमभ्युप गच्छाम *अतएव नित्यत्वमादिभेदेऽप्यभिन्नस्य सत्तावदेवानित्यत्वायोगात् ननु समवायो* यद्येकः सम्बन्ध एव तदा तन्तुपटयोः पटरूपयोर्वा विश्लेषः स्यादिति चेन्न पुनर्विश्लेषाभा वाद्विश्लेषानुपपत्तेः नहि रूपरूपवतोस्तन्तुपटयोर्वा विश्लेषोऽस्ति सम्बन्धयोर्विश्लेषमात्रमस्ति येन विश्लेषः स्यात् पुनर्विशिष्टदेशावच्छेदेन इति चेन्न कदाचिदपि तथानुभवाभावात्

previous unconjoinedness disunion is impossible, for colour and the object coloured or the parts and the whole do not exist out of mutual connection, that there should be a disunion between them If it be replied that such unconjoinedness is possible, we deny this for its possibility is absurd inasmuch as it has never been experienced. U

EIGHTH BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

द्रव्येषु ज्ञानं व्याख्यातम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph. 1 Cognition was explained among substances.

[1] The foregoing digression was intended to gratify the curiosity of the learner The order of enunciation is again embraced

---

[1] शिष्यजिज्ञासानुरोधात् क्रमलङ्घनमिदानीमुद्देशक्रममालम्बते तत्र बुद्धिपरीक्षा अष्टमाध्यायार्थं आत्मसाधनाय पूर्वं बुद्धिरुक्ता तां स्मारयन्नाह । द्रव्येष्विति विषयेण विषयिणं तृतीयाध्यायमुपलक्षयति । इन्द्रियार्थप्रसिद्धिरिन्द्रियार्थेभ्योऽर्थान्तरस्य हेतुः आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षाद्यन्निष्पद्यते तदन्यत् इत्येताभ्यां सूत्राभ्यां ज्ञानं व्याख्यातमित्यर्थः । तत्र बुद्धिरुपलब्धिर्ज्ञानं प्रत्यय इति पर्यायाः इति समानतन्त्रे बुद्धिलक्षणं साङ्ख्यमतनिरासार्थं पर्यायाभिधानम् । साङ्ख्या हि बुद्ध्यादिशब्दानामर्थभेदमाचक्षते तथाहि सत्त्वरजस्तमसां साम्यावस्था प्रकृतिः सा चैकैव पुरुषास्तु परं भिद्यन्ते ते च कूटस्थाः नित्या अपरिणामिनो नित्यचैतन्यस्वभावाः तेच पङ्गवोऽपरिणामित्वात् प्रकृतिस्त्वन्धा जडत्वात् यदा विषयभोगेच्छा प्रकृतिपुरुषभेददिदृक्षा च प्रकृतेर्भवति तदा सा पुरुषोपरागवशात् परिणमते तस्याश्चाद्यः परिणामो बुद्धिरन्तःकरणविशेषः बुद्धिरेव महत्तत्त्वं तदुक्तम् प्रकृतेर्महान् इति सा च बुद्धिर्दर्पणवन्निर्मला तस्याश्च बहिरिन्द्रियप्रणाडिकया विषयाकारो यः परिणतिभेदो घट इति पट इत्याद्याकारस्तज्ज्ञानं वृत्तिरिति चाख्यायते स्वच्छायां बुद्धौ वर्तमानेन ज्ञानेन चैतन्यस्य पुरुषस्य भेदाग्रहादहं जानामीति योऽभिमानविशेषः सैवोपलब्धिः स्रक्चन्दनादिविषयसन्निकर्षादिन्द्रियप्रणाडिकयैव सुखदुःखाद्याकारो बुद्धेरेव यः परिणामविशेषः स प्रत्ययः अतएव ज्ञानसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नसंस्कारधर्माधर्माः सर्व एव बुद्धेः परिणामविशेषाः सूक्ष्ममात्रया प्रकृतावेव वर्तमाना अवस्थाभेदादाविर्भवन्ति तिरोभवन्ति च पुरुषस्तु पुष्करपलाशवन्निर्लेपः प्रतिबिम्बते परं बुद्धाविति यन्मन्यन्ते तदनेन पर्यायाभिधानसूचितप्रमाणेन निराक्रियते तथाहि बुद्धिशब्दो यदि बुध्यतेऽनयेति करणव्युत्पत्त्या तदा मन एव तत्पर्यवस्यति न च मनः प्रत्यक्षं बुद्धिस्त्वहं बुध्ये इति प्रत्यक्षैव न चान्तःकरणस्य ज्ञानादयो धर्माः कर्तृधर्मत्वेनैव तथा सिद्धेः भवति हि अहं जाने अहं प्रत्येमि अहमुपलभे इत्यहन्त्वसामानाधिकरण्येन प्रतिभासः अभिमानोऽसाविति चेत् तात्त्विकत्वे बाधकाभावात् पुरुषस्यागन्तुकधर्मानाधारत्वं कूटस्थत्वं तदेव बाधकमिति चेत् आगन्तुकधर्माधारत्वेऽपि नित्यत्वसम्भवात् नहि धर्माधर्मवच्चैत्यैकं तत्त्वं येन धर्मोत्पादविनाशाभ्यां धर्मोत्पादविनाशौ स्याताम् तथा च एव चेतयते स एव बुध्यते ज्ञानात्युपलभते प्रत्येति चेति नार्थान्तरकल्पना युक्तेत्यादिक ॥

According to this the examination of intellection is the object of the eighth book Intellection has been previously described The present aphorism is stated with the purpose of recalling this By the words Among substances through the object, the third book which treats of that object, i e of substances, is implied The meaning is that cognition has been explained by the two aphorisms The universal notion of organs and their objects is a mark of an entity other than organs and objects, and, That which is brought into being *from contiguity of soul, organ and object, is other than they* In the common declaration of intellection that intellection, apprehension, cognition and affection, are synonyms, the equivalent terms are enumerated in order to contravene the Sankhya doctrine. For the Sánkhyas maintain a distinction of meaning in the terms intelligence &c. Thus the plastic principle is a state of equipoise between purity passion, and darkness This is one, and one only, while spirits are divided to infinity These spirits are uniform, constant, unchangeable, characterised by eternal consciousness These moreover are lame being incapable of *modification*, while the plastic principle is blind, being unsentient When there arises in the plastic principle a desire of the *fruition of sense-objects*, or the wish to see the difference between the plastic principle and spirit the plastic principle is modified in virtue of throwing as it were a tint of colour upon spirit. The first modification of the plastic principle is intellection, a kind of internal sense Intellection it is that is the great principle wherefore it has been said, From the plastic principle the great This intelligence is like a clear mirror, and the particular modification in the form of an object such as a water pot, a piece of cloth &c., by the channel of the external organs of intelligence, is called the cognition, the function of intelligence Apprehension is according to them that particular conceit, whereby, in consequence of the non discrimination of spirit or consciousness by reason of the cognition existing in pure intelligence it is affirmed I know Affection is the par

ticular modification of intelligence, in the form of pleasure, pain &c., by the channel of the sense-organs, in consequence of the presence of objects of sense such as garlands, sandal wood, and the like. Hence it is that all the particular modifications of intelligence, cognition, pleasure pain, desire, aversion, volition, reminiscence, merit, and demerit existing only in the plastic principle in their minute proportions according to diversity of conditions, appear and disappear, while spirit, like a lotus leaf free from stain, reflects them externally in intelligence This doctrine which they hold, is rejected by the evidence indicated in the enumeration of the convertible terms If, then, the word intelligence be derived from agency, inasmuch as it is the instrument of understanding it may be concluded that it is identical with the internal sense, and the internal sense is not perceptible But intelligence is known by the internal perception I understand Moreover the qualities cognition &c., do not belong to the internal organ for they are proved to exist only as being qualities of an agent. For the phenomena of personal knowledge, personal sensation personal apprehension, are manifested only as having personality or egoity as their common substratum *If they reply that this phenomenon is conceit, we rejoin that there is nothing to prove the impossibility of the reality If they say that spirit is unsusceptible of adventitious* modes, and unmodified, and that this shews the impossibility of their reality, we deny this, eternity being compatible with the nature of a substratum of adventitious modes For substance and attribute are not one single principle, that production and destruction of the attribute should be production and destruction of the subject. He then who is conscious, understands, knows, apprehends, and conceits. The hypothesis, therefore of a distinct entity is not allowable U

तत्रात्मा मनश्चाप्रत्यक्षे ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2. Therein soul and the internal sense are imperceptible

This cognition moreover is twofold—science and nescience Science is of four kinds, viz perception, inference, memory and testimony *Nescience likewise is of four kinds, viz doubt, uncertainty, sleep, and inattention* Of these kinds of science that which is inferential is not produced by the sense organs *Why this is so, is stated in the text The soul is here either the soul of another or one's own* The imperceptibility of one's own soul has been already declared, inasmuch as such occasional personal cognitions as that of *one's own paleness attenuation, length of arm &c have been rejected* in relation to the soul. The particle and implies the applicability of the predicate to ether, time, space, air, and atoms Sensible

---

[1] तच्च ज्ञानं द्विविधं विद्या चाविद्या च विद्या चतुर्विधा प्रत्यक्षलैङ्गिकस्मृत्यार्षलक्षणा अविद्यापि चतुर्विधा संशयविपर्ययस्वप्नानध्यवसायलक्षणा तत्र यल्लैङ्गिक तदनिन्द्रियजम् कुत एतदित्याह । आत्मात्र परात्मा स्वात्मा वा स्वात्मनि मानसस्य क्वाचित्काहम्प्रत्ययस्यापि गौरः कृशो महाबाहुरित्यादिप्रत्ययतिरस्कृतत्वात् स्वात्मनोऽप्यप्रत्यक्षता चकारादाकाशकालदिशां वायोः परमाणूनाञ्च द्रव्याणामुपग्रह । इन्द्रियजमपि द्विविधं सर्वज्ञीयमसर्वज्ञीयञ्च सर्वज्ञीयं योगजधर्मलक्षणया प्रत्यासत्त्या तत्तत्दार्थसार्थज्ञानं तथाहि परमाणवः प्रत्यक्षाः प्रमेयत्वादभिधेयत्वात् सत्त्वात् सामग्रीविरहात् कथमेव महत्त्वस्यापि प्रत्यक्षं प्रति कारणत्वात् नच परमाणौ महत्त्व रूपवत्त्वस्यापि चाक्षुषप्रत्यक्षकारणत्वात् नच दिगादयो रूपवन्त इति चेच्च योगजधर्मसहकारिणो मनसैव तत्सम्भवात तदुपग्रहाच्चक्षुरादिना वा अचिन्त्यप्रभावो हि योगजो धर्मो न सहकार्यन्तरमपेक्षते । विवादाध्यासित पुरुषो न सर्वज्ञ पुरुषत्वादहमिवेत्यादि तु प्राभाकरो न मीमांसाभिज्ञ पुरुषत्वादहमिवेत्यादिवद्विपक्षबाधकतर्कशून्यत्वादप्रयोजकम् असर्वज्ञीयञ्च प्रत्यक्षं द्विविधं सविकल्पकं निर्विकल्पकञ्च सविकल्पक ज्ञानं न प्रमाणमिति कीर्तिदिङ्नागादय तथाहि अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभास हि तत् नह्यभिलापेन नाम्ना सम्भवत्यर्थस्य सम्बन्धो येन घट इति पट इति वा नामानुरञ्जित प्रत्यय स्यात् नच जात्यादि परमार्थसत् येन तद्वैशिष्ट्य विषयेषु इन्द्रियेण गृह्यत नच सत स्वलक्षणस्यासता सम्बन्ध सम्भवति नचासत इन्द्रियगोचर तस्मादिन्द्रियेणालोचनं जन्यते आलोचनमहिमाच सविकल्पकमुत्पद्यमानं तत्रार्थे प्रवर्तयत् प्रत्यक्षमिति प्रमाणमिति चोच्यत इति तच्चैतदनुपपन्नमभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभासस्य भवत प्रमाणस्येन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षजन्य स्यादिति सन्निधव्यतिरेकित्वं नामवैशिष्ट्यस्य चाक्षुषज्ञाने सम्भवत्येव सुरभिचन्दनमितिवदुपनीतभानसम्भवात् यद्वा सच्चावैशिष्ट्यप्रत्यक्षज्ञाने न भासते संज्ञायाः स्मरणमात्रमसत्तैव स्मर्यव्यावर्तिका अभावज्ञाने प्रतियोगिस्मरणवत् जात्यादिकञ्च वस्तुभूत साधितमेवात सविकल्पकमपीन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षजत्वात प्रत्यक्षम् । ननु निर्विकल्पक न व्यवहारप्रवर्तकं नवा व्यवहारविषय इति किन्तत्र प्रमाणमिति चेत् सविकल्पकमव तद्धि विशिष्टज्ञानम् नच विशेषणज्ञानमन्तरेण तदुत्पद्यत विशिष्टज्ञाने हि विशेषणज्ञानविशेष्येन्द्रियसन्निकर्षतदुभयासंसर्गाग्रहस्य कारणत्वावधारणात ॥

knowledge is of two degrees, omniscient, and non-omniscient Omniscient is the knowledge of such and such complements of objects, by presentation determined by the merit springing from devotion Thus atoms fall within its sphere, as demonstrable, nameable, and existent If it be objected —Since there is no apparatus of such unbounded sense knowledge, how can this be the case? and whereas magnitude is the cause of perception, and atoms possess no magnitude, and whereas possession of colour is the cause of common perception, and space &c have no colour,—how can this be so? We reply that this objection is invalid, this omniscience being possible by means of the internal sense auxiliary to the merit produced by devotion; or by means of the eye &c in consequence of the acquisition thereof, for the merit engendered by devotion being of inconceivable efficacy, requires no other auxiliary The man in question is not omniscient, being a man like myself —this and similar propositions are not to the point, there being no argument which would render contrary instances impossible, as is the case with the proposition A follower of Prabhákara is not designated a Mímánsaka being a man like myself &c Non-omniscient presentation is of two kinds, discriminative and non-discriminative Kírti-dinnága and others maintain that discriminative cognition conveys no evidence, for it is manifested as apparent through connection with names But there can be no connection of the meaning with the designation or name, that a cognition should be coloured, as it were, by the name water-pot or piece of cloth Moreover the universal or essential &c. is not really existent, that the being characterised by it should be apprehended in objects by the sense organ, and the self characterised existent can have no connection with the non existent, and the non-existent is no object of sense Sight therefore is produced by the organs of sense, and the discriminative cognition (which recognises the class of its object) while in process of being produced by magnitude of vision, is said to be perceptible, and to convey assurance This is impos-

sible, the phenomenon must be cognisable by connection with its designation, and the condition that evidence be produced by contiguity of organ and object is doubtful The being characterised by a name is a possible object of (acquired) visual perception being possible in the same manner as such a presented cognition as that of cool sandal wood Or it may be maintained that the being characterised by *a term does not appear in perceptive knowledge and that* there is only recollection of the name the distinctive appellation *being recalled only in like manner as there is recollection of the* absent object in the cognition of non existence Also it may be maintained the universal &c has a real existence and that there is therefore a discriminative perception produced by apposition of object and organ It may be objected —Non discriminative cognition neither excites to activity nor is an object of activity? what proof therefore is there that it exists? We reply that its proof is found in discriminative cognition for this is a determinate cogni*tion* and this *is not produced without a knowledge of* pre dicates for it is observed that knowledge of the predicates apposition to the modified sense organ and the non apprehension of non-connection of such knowledge and such apposition is the cause of determinate cognition U

ज्ञाननिर्देशे ज्ञाननिष्पत्तिविधिरुक्तः ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The mode in which cognition is originated has been stated in the enunciation of cognition

. [1] The mode in which cognition is originated that is the process by which knowledge is produced, has been explained in the enunciation of cognition that is in the third book where the statement of knowledge was made. The causes of knowledge were

[1] ज्ञाननिर्देशे तृतीयाध्याये यत्र ज्ञानस्य निर्देशः कृतस्तत्रैव तन्निष्पत्तिविधिस्तदुत्पत्तिविधान उक्त आत्मेन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षाद्यन्निष्पद्यते तदन्यत् इति सूत्रे ज्ञानस्य कारणान्युक्तानीत्यर्थ तथाचात्मा ज्ञानस्य समवायिकारणम् आत्ममन संयोगोऽसमवायिकारणम् विषयसन्निकर्षो निमित्तकारणमिति तस्मिन् सूत्रव्याख्यातमिति प्रत्यक्षमधिकृत्य सन्निकर्षस्य हेतुता कथितेति बोद्धव्यम् ॥

stated in the aphorism That which is produced by contiguity of soul, sense organ, and object, is other than those The soul, then, is the co inherent or material cause of cognition, conjunction of the soul and the internal sense is the non coinherent cause, apposition of the object is the occasional or efficient cause This was declared in that aphorism It is therefore, to be understood that the causality of contacts in relation to perception has already been laid down V

गुणकर्मसु सन्निकृष्टेषु ज्ञाननिष्पत्तेर्द्रव्यं कारणम् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Qualities and actions being brought into contact (with the organs of sense), substance is the cause of production of cognition

* Substance is the cause of the cognition which is produced of qualities, as colour &c, and of actions as upheaving &c These are both apprehended only as situate in present substance, the presence therefore of the substance is a requisite of cognition It is by substance, moreover that their contact is constituted, they being apprehended as conjunctly co inherent Although there is apprehended the odour of dispersed particles of the champaka flower, and of portions of camphor which are imperceptible, yet it is substance, imperceptible though it be which effects their contact. Although perceptibility of substance is not a requisite of the apprehension of *sound* yet *sound is only* apprehended *as inherent in substance and this is the requisite If it be asked* Why assume a contact which is invisible? we reply that the production of knowledge, being an effect necessitates the hypothesis of a cause U

---

* गुणेषु रूपादिषु कर्मसु चोत्क्षेपणादिषु यज्ज्ञानं निष्पद्यते तत्र द्रव्यं कारणं यो ग्यद्रव्यनिष्ठमेव तदुभयं गृह्यत इति द्रव्योपस्थितिस्तत्र तन्त्रम संनिकर्षश्च तेषां द्रव्यघटित एव संयुक्तसमवायेन तेषां ग्रहणात् यद्यपि विप्रकीर्णचम्पकावयवकर्पूरभागानामयोग्यता गन्धो गृह्यते तथापि संनिकर्षघटक तत्रायोग्यमपि द्रव्यमेव यद्यपि शब्दग्रहे द्रव्ययोग्यता न तन्त्र तत्रापि तत्रैव समवेतः शब्दो गृह्यत इति तदेव तन्त्रम् नन्वदृष्टसंनिकर्षकल्पना कुत क्रियते इति चेत् ज्ञाननिष्पत्तेः कार्यत्वात् हि कारणमवश्यं कल्पनीयमिति भावः ॥

सामान्यविशेषेषु सामान्यविशेषाभावात्तत एव ज्ञानम् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Inasmuch as in universals and particulars there exist not universals and particulars cognition of general and special essences results thence [from contact effected by substance]

[1] Another mode is stated in which cognition originates The universal is existence the particulars or species are the essences of substance quality, and action. Similarly these being also universals or subaltern genera their particulars or species are the essences of earth &c. of colour &c and of upheaving &c Of these essences residing in substances there results perception common to all the senses thence that is, from the particular perceptible substratum, from their cause, form conjunct co inherence, from co inherence in the conjunctly co inherent, and from co inherence in the co inherent. Knowledge common to all the senses of the essence of qualities, arises from co inherence in the conjunctly co-inherent, of the essence of sound and of *ka* and other particular sounds from co inherence in the co inherent of existence from conjunct co inherence from co inherence in the conjunctly co inherent and from co inherence in the co inherent Conjunct co inherence and co inherence are not presentative of the essence of quality It may therefore be urged that the knowledge of it is impossible through contact with its substratum since in the universal or highest essence existence and in the particulars or sub-

---

[1] अपरं ज्ञाननिष्पत्तिविधिमाह । सामान्यं सत्ता तस्य विशेषा द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वानि एवमेतेषामपि सामान्यानि विशेषाः पृथिवीत्वादिरूपत्वाद्युत्क्षेपणत्वादीनि तत्र द्रव्यगतानां सामान्यानां तत एव योग्याश्रयविशेषादेव तत्सन्निकर्षाच्च संयुक्तसमवायात् संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायात् समवेतसमवायाच्च सार्वेन्द्रियं ज्ञानं गुणत्वे च संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायात् शब्दत्वकत्वादौ समवेतसमवायात् सत्तायां संयुक्तसमवायात् संयुक्तसमवेतसमवायात् समवेतसमवायाच्च सार्वेन्द्रियं ज्ञानम् गुणत्वे च संयुक्तसमवायसमवायश्च न प्रत्यासत्तिरिति ननु तत एव स्वाश्रयसन्निकर्षादेवेत्यवधारणानुपपत्तिः यतः सामान्ये विशेषेषु च पृथिवीत्वादिषु सामान्यविशेषान्तरमस्त्यतः तत्सन्निकर्षोऽपि कारणमित्यत आह । सामान्यविशेषाभावादिति नहि सामान्यविशेषेषु सामान्यविशेषाः सन्ति अनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् तथा परस्परभेदप्रतीतिः स्वरूपत एव गवेतरावृत्तित्वे सति सकलगोवृत्तित्वलक्षणापार धिरभेदाद्वा एव घटत्वादावपीति ॥

altern genera, the essence of substance, quality, and action, and in the essences of earth &c there are universals and particulars. In anticipation of this objection the words Inasmuch as there exist not therein universals and particulars, have been added For there exist not in universals and particulars other universals and particulars essences that is of the essence of objects, for thus there would result a regression to infinity The appearance of mutual difference between these essences proceeds from their proper form, or from difference of essential attributes existing for instance, in all cows, there being non existence of such attributes in objects other than cows, and similarly with the essence of water pots and other objects U

सामान्यविशेषापेक्षं द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 [Cognition] of substances, qualities, and actions supposes the universal and particular

[1] It may be asked whether the cognition of substances, qualities and actions is also absolute in the same manner as the knowledge of universals and particulars is absolute inasmuch as there exist not in them universality and particularity It is stated that it is not. Cognition is produced —these words are to be supplied *Of substances qualities and actions* there is an apprehension determined by the natures of substances, qualities, and actions. Now, *a determinate cognition is produced by contact of subject, attribute, and sense-organ*, the universal and particular are therefore necessarily supposed in it. For there exists such determinate cognition as This is a substance, This is a quality, This is an action U

---

[1] ननु सामान्यविशेषेषु सामान्यविशेषाभावात्तथा तद्विषयकमेव ज्ञानं तथा द्रव्यगुणकर्मस्वपि किं तद्विषयकमेव नेत्याह । ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते इति प्रकृतम् द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वविशिष्टबुद्धिरस्ति यदस्ति विशिष्टज्ञानस्य विशेष्यविशेषणसन्निकर्षादुत्पद्यते इति सामान्यविशेषापेक्षा तत्रावश्यकी भवति हि द्रव्यमिदं गुणोऽयं कर्मेदमिति विशिष्टज्ञानमिति भावः ॥

द्रव्ये द्रव्यगुणकर्मापेक्षम् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 [Cognition] of substance supposes substance, quality and action

[1] In the cognition, The white cow with bells is walking, the bell a substance is an attribution, white is a quality, is walking is an action There is, therefore, no determinate cognition without a determinatinon apprehended, nor can such exist without connection with a determination Substances, qualities and actions, are therefore supposed in the cognition of a substance. U

गुणकर्मसु गुणकर्माभावाद्गुणकर्मापेक्षं न विद्यते ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 Inasmuch as there exist no qualities and actions in qualities and actions, there is no cognition thereof which supposes qualities and actions

[2] The aphorism is given in reply to the question Why therefore do not quality and actions suppose quality and action? There is an ellipsis of the word cognition Inasmuch as of quality there is no conception determined by quality, and of action no conception determined by action there is no conception thereof which supposes qualities and actions For quality does not exist in quality, or action in action that it should appear therein as a predicate or determination. U

समवायिनः श्वैत्याच्छ्वैत्यबुद्धेश्च श्वेते बुद्धिस्ते एते कार्यकारणभूते ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 The cognition of a white object results from the whiteness of the substratum and from the cognition of whiteness, and these same stand in a relation of cause and effect.

[1] ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते इति प्रकृते घण्टावान् शुक्लो गौर्गच्छतीति ज्ञानम् तत्र द्रव्यं घण्टा विशेषणम् शुक्ल इति गुणः गच्छतीति कर्म तथाच नागृहीतविशेषणा विशिष्टबुद्धिरिति न वा विशेषणसम्बन्धमन्तरेणेति भवति द्रव्यज्ञाने द्रव्यगुणकर्मापेक्षेति भावः ॥

[2] अथ किं गुणकर्मणोरपि गुणकर्मापेक्षा नेत्याह। ज्ञानमितिशेषः। गुणे गुणविशिष्टबुद्धेः कर्मसु कर्मविशिष्टबुद्धेरभावात् गुणकर्मापेक्षा न तद्वद्बुद्धिः नहि गुणेषु गुणो वा कर्मसु कर्म येन तत्र विशेषणत्वेन भासेतेति भावः ॥

[2] From the whiteness or white colour of the substratum, and from the cognition of whiteness or the cognition of an attribute consisting of white colour, there results in relation to a white object, a conch-shell &c. possessed of white colour, a cognition that it is white, that is, a sense-given certainty determined by white colour The possession, therefore, of white colour, and the cognition of white colour are the causes of an effect, viz of sense given certainty the form of which is white colour The relation, then, of co inherence affords no conditions of sense given assurance in the form of white colour, viz possession of white colour, and cognition of white colour There is, therefore, in consequence of the absence from qualities and actions of qualities and actions as determinations, no perceptive assurance in the form of qualities and actions V

द्रव्येष्वनितरेतरकारणाः ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 [Cognitions] *of substances are not causes one of the other*

[1] It might be urged that in cases where after the perception, This is a water pot, there arises the perception, This is a piece of cloth, the knowledge of the water pot is a cause of the knowledge of the piece of cloth, inasmuch as it is antecedent to it and that consequently there could be no knowledge of the piece of cloth without a knowledge of the water pot. This collateral objection

---

[1] समवायिन इत्यभिधानात् सम्बन्धस्य कारणत्वमाह । तथाच गुणे गुणसमवायाभावात् कर्मसु धर्मसमवायाभावाच्च न तज्ज्ञाने गुणकर्मापेक्षा विशेषणत्वेन विशेष्यत्वेन स्वस्यैव एवञ्च श्वेत शङ्ख इत्यादिप्रतीतौ श्वैत्यगुणस्य श्वैत्यविशेषणज्ञानस्य च कारणत्वमित्युक्तं तथाच विशेषणसम्बन्धविशेषणतज्ज्ञानानां विशिष्टप्रत्ययप्रमां प्रति कारणत्वमिति तेन पूर्वोक्त एवं सिध्यति ॥

[2] समवायिन श्वैत्यसमवायिन श्वैत्यात शुक्लरूपात श्वैत्यबुद्धे शुक्लरूपात्मकविशेषणबुद्धेश्च श्वेते शुक्लरूपवति शङ्खादौ बुद्धिः शुक्लोऽयमिति शुक्लरूपविशेषणिका प्रत्यक्षप्रमितिर्भवति अतस्ते शुक्लरूपवत्त्वशुक्लरूपबुद्धी कार्यस्य शुक्लरूपप्रकारकप्रत्यक्षप्रमात्मकस्य कारणभूते इत्यर्थः तथाच समवायसम्बन्धेन शुक्लरूपप्रकारकप्रत्यक्षप्रमां प्रति शुक्लरूपवत्त्व शुक्लरूपज्ञानस्य द्वयमेव सन्धर्मिति गुणकर्मसु गुणकर्मरूपविशेषणाभावाच्च तत्प्रकारकप्रत्यक्षप्रमितिरिति भावः ॥

is denied Cognitions—for this word is to be supplied—are not the causes one of the other, that is, the mutual causes, in the case of cognitions of substances not determinant of substances fixed in the relation of prior and posterior among substances Though, therefore, the knowledge of the water pot be antecedent to the knowledge of the piece of cloth, it is not its cause, inasmuch as it is not its invariable antecedent V

कार्य्ययौगपद्यात् कारणक्रमाच्च घटपटादिबुद्धीनां क्रमो न हेतुफलभावात् ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 The sequence of the cognitions of the water pot, piece of cloth &c. resulting from non simultaneity of the causes [of the cognitions] and from the sequence of their causes, does not result from a relation of cause and effect

¹ The sequence constituted by priority and posteriority, of the cognitions of the water pot piece of cloth &c., does not result from the relation of reason and consequent or of cause and effect but from the sequence that is from the priority and posteriority of the

¹ घटपटादिबुद्धीनां क्रमः पौर्वापर्य्यञ्च न हेतुफलभावात् न कार्यकारणभावात् किन्तु तादृशबुद्धिकारणानां घटपटादिसन्निकर्षादीनां क्रमात् पौर्वापर्य्यात् चकारोऽनुक्तमयौगपद्यं समुच्चिनोति अयञ्चकारः क्रम इत्यनन्तरं योजनीयः अयञ्च घटपटादिबुद्धीनामयौगपद्यं तत्कारणानां सन्निकर्षादीनामयौगपद्यादित्यर्थः यत्र तु घटपटसन्निकर्षादीनामस्ति यौगपद्यम् तत्र युगपदेव सन्निकृष्टयावत्पदार्थविषयिणी समूहालम्बनात्मिका बुद्धिरुत्पद्यत इति कारणयौगपद्यात् कार्ययौगपद्यं कारणक्रमात् कार्यक्रमश्चेत्यपि बोद्धव्यम् । बुद्धिः प्रथमतो द्विविधा अनुभूतिः स्मृतिश्च अनुभूतिरपि कणादमते द्विविधा प्रत्यक्षानुमितिभेदात् प्रत्यक्षमपि घ्राणजादिभेदेन षड्विधं सविकल्पकनिर्विकल्पकभेदेन च द्विविधं लौकिकालौकिकभेदेन द्विविधञ्च अनुमितिरपि केवलान्वयिकेवलव्यतिरेक्यन्वयव्यतिरेकिरूपत्रिविधानुमानजन्यत्वात् त्रिविधा तत्रेदं वा ज्ञेयत्वादित्यादिकं केवलान्वय्यनुमानम् पृथिवीतरेभ्यो भिद्यते गन्धवत्त्वादित्यादिकं केवलव्यतिरेक्यनुमानम् अन्वयव्यतिरेक्यनुमानन्तु पर्वतो वह्निमान् धूमादित्यादिकमिति । स्मृतिश्चोपेक्षानात्मकनिश्चयाधीनसमानाकारकभावनाख्यसंस्काराधीना एकविधैव प्रकारान्तरेणापि बुद्धिर्द्विविधा प्रमाऽप्रमा चेति तद्वति तत्प्रकारिका बुद्धिस्तत्प्रमा तदभाववति तत्प्रकारिका बुद्धिस्तदप्रमा संशयनिश्चयभेदेनापि बुद्धिर्द्विविधा तत्रैकधर्मिणि विरुद्धभावाभावप्रकारकं ज्ञानं संशयः तदभावाप्रकारकं तत्प्रकारकं ज्ञानं तन्निश्चयः एतन्मते सादृश्यज्ञानस्थले उपदेशज्ञानस्थले च तदुत्तरं लिङ्गपरामर्शात्पश्चादनुमितिर्भवति प्रमाणं द्विविधं प्रत्यक्षमनुमानञ्चेति यथार्थानुभवश्च प्रमा एतच्चाग्रे सूत्रकृदेव वक्ष्यतीति संक्षेपः ॥

contacts &c. of the water pot, piece of cloth &c, which are the causes of such cognitions. The particle and implies the addition of an unmentioned non simultaneity, and this word is to be construed after the term sequence The meaning is therefore that the non simultaneity of the cognitions of the water pot piece of cloth &c results from the non simultaneity of the contacts &c with these that are the causes of those cognitions. But where there is a simultaneity of contacts &c of water pots pieces of cloth &c, there is *produced simultaneously a cognition which is a support or* basis of an aggregate and which has for its objects the things in contact so many as they may be It is therefore to be understood that there results from simultaneity of cause simultaneity of effect, and from non sequence of cause non sequence of effect. Intelligence is primarily divided into experience, and memory Experience according to the doctrine of Kanáda is of two kinds being divided into perception and inference Perception is of six kinds, as derived from *smelling &c. [from the five external and from the* internal sense], and is twofold as discriminative and non-discriminative, and twofold as divided into physical and hyperphysical. Inference is threefold as produced by illation from only positive conditions from only negative conditions and from both positive and negative conditions For example This is a proposition inasmuch as it is knowable &c., is an illation from only positive conditions, Earth differs from other *substances inasmuch as it is possessed of odours,* &c. is an illation from only negative conditions, The mountain is fiery inasmuch as it smokes &c., is an illation from both positive and negative conditions. Memory is uniform dependent on the reproduction called permanent mental impression the universal form whereof is dependent on assurance not characterised by inattention In another point of view also intelligence is twofold *science and nescience. Science is a cognition in a certain form* of that which has that form Nescience is a cognition in a certain form of that in which there is non existence of that

form Intelligence is also twofold, accordingly as it is divided into certainty and uncertainty Uncertainty is a cognition whereof the form is mutually repugnant existence and non-existence in one and the same subject of attributes, certainty in regard to a thing is cognition in the form thereof, and not in the form of the non existence thereof According to this doctrine in the case of cognition of similarity, and in that of knowledge of terms, an inference takes place by the *production of a judgment respecting a mark or middle term, subsequently thereto Evidence is of two* kinds, perception and inference, and accordingly science is correct experience, as will be explained by the author of the aphorisms himself in the sequel. V

SECOND DAILY LESSON

अयमेष त्वयाकृतं भोजयैनमिति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 This, That, Done by thee, Feed him,—such expressions are relative to cognition

[1] It is stated that certain cognitions are determinant of other cognitions. The cognition *This is a water pot, This is a piece of cloth, is relative to cognition, that is determinant of a cognition* This and that being capable of being made objects of perception, cognition in the form of perception, is a determination of such a cognition The word Thou being capable of being made the object of the speaker's intention, inasmuch as it is the substratum of a self manifested knowledge, the cognition produced by the expression Done by thee, is determinant of a cognition In the behest Feed him, also, the cognition produced by the word him, which has the sense of this one, is determinant of a cognition which is a perception V

---

[1] बुद्धिविशेषणिका अपि काश्चिद्बुद्धयो भवन्तीत्याह। अयमेष इति अयं घटः अयं पट इतिज्ञानं बुद्ध्यपेक्षं बुद्धिविशेषणकम् इदमेतदोः प्रत्यक्षविषये शक्तत्वात् प्रत्यक्षरूपा बुद्धिस्तादृग्ज्ञाने विशेषणम् युष्मच्छब्दस्य स्वजन्यबोधाश्रयतया वक्तुरभिप्रायविषये शक्तत्वात् त्वयाकृतमितिवाक्यजन्यं ज्ञानं बुद्धिविशेषणकं भोजयैनमिति इदमर्थैनशब्दजन्यज्ञानमपि प्रत्यक्षात्मकबुद्धिविशेषणकम् ॥

दृष्टेषु भावाददृष्टेष्वभावात् ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Inasmuch as [such expressions] exist in reference to objects seen, and do not exist in reference to objects unseen

[1] It is shown that this is inductively proved by concomitance and exclusion. When there exists the contiguous object of the cognition This, and the remote object of the cognition That, when there exists the contiguous agent, the object of the cognition By thee, and the object of the action, the object of the notion, Done, and when there exist the giver and the receiver of the order, the objects of the notion Feed, in contiguity, then a cognition of this kind (i e one determined by another cognition) is produced But in the case of unseen objects these cognitions are not manifested This therefore may be inferred by the methods of agreement and disagreement U

[2] That these terms are applicable to an object differentiated by a mode constituted by cognition may be inferred by the methods of agreement and disagreement These expressions have applicability to an object differentiated by modes constituted by cognition, inasmuch as the use of the words This &c exists in relation to objects seen or known that is essentially determined by modes consisting of cognition and inasmuch as such use does not exist in relation to objects unseen or unknown that is not essentially determined by modes consisting of cognition V

[1] अन्वयव्यतिरेकपरिच्छेद्यमेवैतदित्याह। पदार्थमितिबुद्धेः सन्निकृष्टो विषय एष इतिबुद्धेर्विप्रकृष्टोऽपि बुद्ध्यारूढो विषय त्वयेतिबुद्धे सन्निकृष्ट कर्ता विषय कृतमितिबुद्धे कर्म विषय भोजयेतिबुद्धेर्नियोज्यनियोक्तारौ विषयौ एतमितिबुद्धेस्तदुभयव्यापारो विषयः सन्निकृष्टो भवति तदैतादृशी बुद्धिरुत्पद्यते अदृष्टेषु तु विषयेषु नैता बुद्धय प्रादुर्भवन्तीत्यन्वयव्यतिरेकगम्यमेवैतदित्यर्थं ॥

[2] एतेषां पदानां ज्ञानघटितधर्मावच्छिन्ने शक्तिरन्वयव्यतिरेकगम्येत्याह। दृष्टेषु ज्ञातेषु ज्ञानघटितधर्मावच्छिन्नेष्वव्यभिचारत भावात इदमादिशब्दप्रयोगस्य सत्त्वात अदृष्टेषु अज्ञातेषु ज्ञानघटितधर्मानवच्छिन्नेष्वव्यभिचारत अभावात् तादृशप्रयोगस्यासत्त्वात् बुद्धिघटितधर्मावच्छिन्न एव तेषां शक्तिरित्यर्थं ॥

अर्थ इति द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु ॥ ३ ॥

Aph. 3 The term object applies to substances, qualities and actions

The senses and their objects

द्रव्येषु पञ्चात्मकत्वं प्रतिषिद्धम् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 Under substances identity with the five elements was denied.

[1] This aphorism is stated as the basis of a treatment of the sense-organs, their nature, and the nature of the objects which they apprehend Under substances, that is, in the aphorisms describing substances, identity with the five elements possession of the matter of the five elements, was denied or impugned No substance then whether the body or any other, has the nature of the five elements but all bodies and organs of sense have the nature of some one or other single element V

भूयस्त्वाद्गन्धवत्त्वाच्च पृथिवी गन्धज्ञाने प्रकृतिः ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 In the cognition of odour earth is the matter, inasmuch as it possesses plurality and odour

[2] Accordingly it is stated that the organ of smell apprehends only smell among the qualities, and has the nature of earth only The cognition of odour means that from which the cognition or sensation, of smell is derived that is the organ of smell. Earth the subtile element is the nature or material cause inasmuch as it

---

[1] किमिन्द्रियं किम्प्रकृतिकं किमर्थग्राहकमित्यभिधातुं पीठं रचयति । द्रव्येषु द्रव्यनिरूपणसूत्रेषु पञ्चात्मकत्वं पञ्चभूतप्रकृतिकत्वं प्रतिषिद्धं निराकृतं तथाच शरीरादिकं किञ्चिदपि द्रव्यं न पञ्चभूतप्रकृतिकं किन्त्वेकैकभूतप्रकृतिकान्येव सर्वाणि शरीराणीन्द्रियाणि चेतिभावः ॥

[2] अथ घ्राणेन्द्रियं गुणेषु गन्धमात्रग्राहकं पृथिवीमात्रप्रकृतिकञ्चेत्याह । गन्धस्य ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षं यस्मात् तद्गन्धज्ञानं घ्राणेन्द्रियं तत्र पृथिवी तन्मात्रं प्रकृतिः समवायिकारणम् भूयस्त्वात् जलाद्यनभिभूतभागारब्धत्वात् गन्धवत्त्वाच्च रसाद्यग्राहकत्वात् घ्राणेन्द्रियं न जलाद्यारब्धम् गन्धवत्त्वञ्चात्र ग्राहकतासम्बन्धेन गन्धग्राहकत्वादिति फलितार्थं तथाच घ्राणेन्द्रियं पार्थिवं रूपादिषु मध्ये गन्धस्यैव व्यञ्जकत्वात् कुङ्कुमगन्धाभिव्यञ्जकसर्पिर्वदित्यनुमानेन घ्राणस्य पृथिव्युपादानकत्वं सिध्यतीति भावः ॥

has plurality, or is originated by particles not overpowered by water &c., and possesses odour The olfactory organ is not originated by water &c, inasmuch as it does not apprehend taste &c Possession of odour exists therein inasmuch as, in its relation as percipient, it apprehends odours In like manner the organ of smell is terrestrial, inasmuch as it reveals odour only among colour and the other qualities, just as clarified butter, &c manifests the odour of saffron By this inference it is established that earth is the material cause of the organ of smell. V

तथापस्तेजोवायुश्च रसरूपस्पर्शविशेषात् ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 In like manner water, light and air, are [the material causes of the organs of taste sight, and touch] inasmuch as they have no difference from taste, colour, and touch

[1] The words Are the material causes of the organs of taste, sight, and touch, are to be supplied Water &c are respectively the material causes of the organs of taste &c inasmuch as they respectively apprehend those determinate objects In these plurality is the condition of the determination It has been declared that it is determination by possession of the particular qualities of apprehensible kind that is the proof of the possession of taste &c by the organs of taste &c. In like manner the organ of hearing is a part of ether essentially determined by the outer ear influenced by particular destiny U

NINTH BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावात् प्रागसत् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 [An effect] is antecedently non-existent inasmuch as there is non-existence of assertion of actions and qualities

---

[1] रसनचक्षुस्त्वगिन्द्रियाणां प्रकृतिरितिशेषः तेन यथासंख्यं रसनादीनामप्यादयः प्रकृतयः तत्तत्प्रतिनियतार्थग्राहकत्वात् अत्रापि नियमे भूयस्त्वमेव तन्त्रम् रसादिमत्त्वे च रसनादीनां ग्राह्यजातीयविशेषगुणवत्त्वनियम एव प्रमाणमित्युक्तम् श्रवणं च विशिष्टादृष्टोपगृहीतकर्णशष्कुल्यवच्छिन्नो नभोदेश एव श्रोत्रम् ॥

[1] The words an effect are to be supplied. Antecedently, that is before the production of an effect, an effect or product, such as a water pot or piece of cloth, is non existent, that is non-existent by self-determined negation during that time. The reason assigned is the absence of predication of actions and qualities If the effect, the water pot &c., were existent during that time, it would be affirmed to possess actions and qualities, as in the case of a water pot already produced such affirmations are made as that the water pot is is at rest, or in motion or seen to be coloured There is no such assertion antecedent to its production It is therefore inferred that it is during that time non-existent While straws are in course of weaving or threads of joining or when clay is placed on the potter's wheel, while the work of the potter &c is yet going on, there is a universally experienced sensitive cognition that there will be in that place a mat, or a piece of cloth or a water jar inasmuch as it is producing during the tension of the eyes Herein a cognition constituted either by conjunction or by co inherence could not be efficient, the presentation is therefore a possession of determina-

[1] कार्यमिति शेषः प्रागिति कार्योत्पत्तेः प्राक् कार्यं घटपटादि असत् तत्कालीनस्वज न्याभावप्रतियोगीत्यर्थः अत्र हेतुः क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावात् यदि तदानीमपि कार्यं घटादि सदेव स्यात् तदा क्रियावत्त्वेन गुणवत्त्वेन च व्यपदिश्येत यथोत्पन्ने घटे तिष्ठति इति घटश्चलति श्यामो दृश्यते घट इत्यादिप्रकारेण व्यपदिश्यते न तथोत्पत्तेः प्रागपि कार्यव्यपदेशोऽस्ति तेन गम्यते तदानीमसदिति सच व्यूह्यमानेषु वीरणेषु योज्यमानेषु तन्तुषु चक्रारूढायां मृदि कुलालादिव्यापारेषु अनुवर्तमानेषु भविष्यत्यत्र कटः पटो घटो वेति सार्वलौकिकी प्रत्यक्षप्रतीतिः चक्षुर्विस्फारणानन्तरं जायमानत्वात् न च संयोगसमवायान्यतरघटिता प्रत्यासत्तिरत्र प्रभवति तस्मादिन्द्रियसम्बद्धविशेषणता प्रत्यासत्तिरत्र तत्त्वम ननु चान्योन्याश्रय सत्या विशेषणतया तत्प्रतीतिः प्रतीतौ च विशेषणतेति एव विशेषणता हि तद्भावस्वरूपमथ उपश्लिष्टप्रत्ययजननयोग्यं तत्त्वं प्रतीतेः पूर्वमपि सदेव तदुक्तं व्यावर्तितं समवायेऽभाव च विशेषणविशेष्यभाव इति सतार्थ प्रागभाव प्रतियोगिजनक नहि घटे जाते स एव घटस्तदानीमेवोत्पद्यते तत्र कारणान्तरसत्त्वेऽपि कारणत्वेनस्वमनुमियमाणं स्वप्रागभावमेकल्पमंशानुमन्तुमर्हति तद्घटोत्पत्तौ स एव घट प्रतिबन्धक इति वक्तांदं प्रतिबन्धकाभावत्वेन तस्य कारणत्वमपर्जनीयम् ननु यदि घट एव तस्याभावस्तदा घटे नष्टे तदुन्मज्जनापत्तिरिति चेन्न घटनाशस्यापि तद्विरोधित्वात् नहि विरोधिध्वंसकालेऽपि विरोध्यन्तरप्रादुर्भाव इति नष्टनष्टयोर्देशकता विरोधो येन तोत्पादवत्ययस समानकालीनत्व स्यात् तर्हि कालकृततया कथमेककालावस्थापित्व भवेत् ॥

tions related to the sense organs Such is the condition of such a cognitive act If it be objected that we are arguing in a circle inasmuch as the cognition thereof depends on the determination and the determination on the cognition, we reply that such is not the case for the determination is the proper form of both the cognition and its object and is capable of producing a proximate assurance and this proper *form* has an *existence* antecedent to the cognition It has accordingly been stated in the Nyāya vārttika that in co inherence, and in non existence, there is a relation of cause and effect This antecedent non existence produces a non existent, for when a water pot has been produced, that self same water pot is not then brought into existence for even if there exist therein another cause, an ensuing defect of the cause must follow the defect of its own anterior non existence If this self same water-pot is what prevents the production of that water pot, then its causality is inevitable by reason of the non existence of anything which prevents It may be urged that if there be in the water pot non existence of the same then it follows that it will emerge when the water pot is destroyed This we deny inasmuch as the very destruction of the water pot is repugnant thereto For one of two contradictories cannot be manifested during the existence of the other contradictory For between these two there is no repugnance effected by space i e no exclusion that as in the case of the real natures of the cow and the horse there could be a simultaneity How then could there be a repugnance effected by time and how could there be a synchronous existence? U

[1] This aphorism is stated as a basis for a description of perception of non existence An effect as a water pot and the like

[1] अभावप्रत्यक्षमभिधित्सुर्भूमिकामाह । घटादिकार्ये स्वोत्पत्ते प्रागसत क्रियाया गुणस्य च व्यपदेशस्य व्यवहारस्याभावात घटे जाते यथा घटस्तिष्ठति घटश्चलति घट श्याम इत्यादिक्रियागुणव्यवहारो भवति पूर्वन्तु न तथा व्यवहार इत्यर्थ अत सत्का र्यवादे निरस्त इति घटोत्पत्ते पूर्वे घटप्रागभावस्तिष्ठतीति सच प्रतियोगिजनक कथ मन्यथा कारणान्तरसत्वे उत्पन्नस्य न पुनरुत्पाद इदानीं घटो भविष्यतीत्यादि प्रत्य क्षमपि प्रागभावे मानमिति ॥

is non-existent previous to its production, inasmuch as there is non-existence of the assertion or expression of action and quality There *is antecedently no such expression of qualities and action, as there* is after the pot is produced, as that the jar is at rest, or in motion, or that it is dark. Thus the doctrine of the pre existence of effects in their causes is rejected Previous, therefore to the production of *the water jar, there is antecedent non-existence thereof* and this produces a non existent. Else how, when there exists another cause could there not be reproduction of the produced? A perception such as that there will presently exist a water-pot in this place, is a proof of antecedent non-existence. V

सदसत् ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 The existent [becomes] non existent

[1] *It is stated that another non-existence is established by the* force of perception It is proved by perception and inference that an existent product such as a water pot after the operation of a hammer &c. which destroys it, is now non-existent, in like manner as it is proved by perception and inference that an effect is, previous to the operation of its cause, non existent. This mode of non-existence is commonly called destruction (or subsequent or emergent non existence), for there are such cognitions as that a water pot is destroyed, or that the letter *ga* previously heard is now no more U

असतः क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावादर्थान्तरम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 [Existence] is a thing distinct from non existence, inasmuch as actions and qualities are not ascribed [to the non existent]

---

[1] यथा कारणव्यापारात् पूर्वं प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यां कार्यस्यासत्त्वं प्रमीयते तथा, विनाशकस्य मुद्गरादेर्व्यापारानन्तरं सदेव कार्यं घटादि इदानीमसदिति प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामेव प्रमीयते सचायमभावो ध्वंस इति गीयते भवति हि घटो नष्टो ध्वस्त इदानीं श्रुतपूर्वो गकारो नास्तीत्यादिधीरिति भावः ॥

[1] It may be objected that it is the water pot that under particular conditions produces the conventional notion of destruction but the destruction of the water pot is nothing else than the water-pot itself The aphorism is therefore laid down. The word Existence is to be supplied Existence then is a thing distinct from non-existence. *If it be asked why it is stated that it is so because* actions and qualities are not ascribed to the non existent For there are not employed during subsequent non-existence such phrases as The water pot exists There is a water pot, The water pot is now possessed of colour Bring the water pot In consequence of this difference the existent is a thing different from the non existent. U

सच्चासत् ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 *The existent also is non existent*

[2] Antecedent and subsequent non existence being vindicated the present aphorism is laid down with the purpose of evincing reciprocal non existence When the words Is not are asserted of an *existent water pot, there appears an absence of identity* For there are such cognitions as that a horse is not identical with a cow a cow is non existent as a horse a piece of cloth is non existent as a water pot a piece of cloth is not a water pot a cow is not a horse a horse is not a cow There appears then in such a

---

[1] ननु घट एवावस्थाविशेषे ध्वंसव्यवहारं करोति न तु घटादन्यस्तस्य ध्वंस इत्यत आह । सदिति सूत्रशेषः असतः सत् अर्थान्तरं कुत इत्यत आह क्रियागुणव्यपदेशाभावादिति नहि प्रध्वंसाभावेऽपि वर्तते घटः अस्ति घटः इदानीं रूपवान् घटः घटमानये त्यादिव्यपदेशस्तदिदं वैधर्म्यादसतः सदर्थान्तरमिति ॥

[2] प्रागभावप्रध्वंसौ साधयित्वाऽन्योन्याभावं साधयितुमाह । यत्र सदेव घटादि असदिति व्यवह्रियते तत्र तादात्म्याभावः प्रतीयते भवति हि अश्वात्मना गौरसन् गवात्मना अश्वः असन् पटो घटात्मना अघटः पटः अनश्वो गौः अगौरश्वश्च इत्यादिप्रतीतिः तदस्यामश्वोऽन्योन्याभाववान् गौः पटान्योन्याभाववान् घटः इत्यन्योन्याभाव एव तादात्म्याभावापरनामा भासते तदत्र तादात्म्यं प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकम् प्रतियोगिसमानाधिकरणश्चायमभावः भवति हि पटो न भूतलमिति प्रतीतिः नित्यश्च कदाचिदपि घटपटयोस्तादात्म्यासम्भवात् ॥

cognition the fact that a cow possesses reciprocal non-existence with a horse a water pot is reciprocally non existent with a piece of cloth, and this reciprocal non existence is otherwise designated absence of identity The identity then in this case is essentially non-existent and this non existence is in coexistent with the non existent object, for there are such cognitions as that the water pot is not the ground on which it is placed This non existence is eternal for it is impossible that there could ever be identity between a water pot and a piece of cloth U

अत्यान्यदसदतस्तदसत् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 *Whatever else, moreover, than these is non existent is* [absolutely] *non existent.*

[1] The. fourth non existence called absolute non-existence is here described Whatever else than these that is than the three fore-mentioned non existences is non existent, that is is absolutely non existent The final and complete sense of the aphorism, therefore, is that the non existence which is distinct from these three non existences is absolute non existence Of these antecedent non-existence has a subsequent limit, subsequent non existence has an anterior limit reciprocal non existence in coexists with that which is non existent, *but absolute non existence differs from all the three and is therefore a fourth non-existence* *N* *V*

[2] That which is non existent repugnant to existence, other than the three forementioned non existences is non-existent abso

---

[1] इदानीं चतुर्थमभावमत्यन्ताभावाख्यमाह । अत पूर्वोक्तादभावत्रयाद् यदन्यदसत् तदसत तदत्यन्तासत्त्वम असदित्युभयत्र भावप्रधाननिर्देश तत्रैकमसदुद्देश्यमसद्विधेयम तथाचोक्ताभावत्रयभिन्नो योऽभाव सोऽत्यन्ताभाव इति पर्यवसितोऽर्थ तत्र प्रागभावस्य उत्तरावधिकत्वम प्रध्वंसस्य पूर्वावधिकत्वम अन्योन्याभावस्य प्रतियोगिसमानाधिकरण्यमत्यन्ताभावस्य तु त्रितयवैधर्म्यमतश्चतुर्थोऽयमभाव ॥

[2] अत उक्तादभावत्रयादन्यद यत असत् भावभिन्नम तदसत अत्यन्तासत्त्व भावप्रधाननिर्देशोऽयम् अत्यन्ताभावाख्यमिति तु फलितार्थ अयञ्चात्यन्ताभावस्तुरीयोऽभाव सनातनश्च प्रतियोगितत्प्रागभावतद्ध्वंसास्त्वय एवात्यन्ताभावस्य विरोधिन रक्तघटे श्याम रूप नास्ति श्यामघटे र रूप नास्तीतिप्रतीतिश्च ध्वंसप्रागभावावगा

lutely non existent That usually refers to the existent The complete sense is that it is technically designated absolute non existence This absolute non existence is the fourth non existence and is eternal There are three things repugnant to absolute non-existence the object non-existent and its prior and posterior non-existences According to the ancients the cognitions that dark colour does not exist in a red water pot and that red colour does not exist in a dark water pot are conversant about the subsequent and antecedent non existences while the moderns have maintained that the subsequent and antecedent non-existences are not repugnant to absolute non existence, and that consequently there may be absolute non existence even during the time of subsequent non existence They (the moderns) hold that when a water pot &c previously removed is brought back to a place there is during the existence there of the water pot no notion of absolute non existence of the water pot inasmuch as the time during which the water pot is there constitutes no connection with non existence Some have taught that when there has formerly stood in any place a water pot &c and this has been removed and brought back again there appears in this case a fourth kind of universal non existence characterised by production and destruction and designated temporary non existence and not absolute non existence V

असदिति भूतप्रत्यक्षाभावात् भूतस्मृतेर्विरोधिप्रत्यक्षवत् ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 [Perception] that a thing is non existent results from non existence of a past perception and reminiscence of the past like the perception of a repugnant object

---

ध्वंसे नात्यन्ताभावमिति प्राञ्चः नव्यास्तु ध्वंसप्रागभावयोर्नात्यन्ताभावविरोधित्वमतो ध्वंसादिकालावच्छेदेनाप्यत्यन्ताभावो वर्तत एव यत्र भूतले पूर्वमपसारितं घटादिकं पुनरानीतं तत्र घटकालस्याभावसम्बन्धाघटकत्वाद्घटसत्त्वकाले न घटात्यन्ताभावबुद्धिः स्यात् क्वचित्तु यत्र भूतले पूर्वं घटादिकं स्थितमथापसारितं पुनरानीतञ्च तत्रोत्पादविनाशशाली सामयिकनामा चतुर्थः संसर्गाभाव एव प्रतीयते नात्यन्ताभाव इत्याहुः ॥

¹ Another section is here commenced in which this *aphorism* is stated enouncing the apparatus of the perception of emergent non existence Cognition in the form of perception is implied by the particle *iti* There is therefore a perceptive cognition that a water pot for instance is non-existent that a water pot has been destroyed *or that a water pot is subsequently non-existent* This is exemplified by perception of the repugnant, there being as clear and distinct a perception of a repugnant (or at present non existent) water pot &c as of its subsequent non existence The reason of this is non-existence of a past perception the absence that is to say of a past produced and destroyed water pot and the like The experience is thus accounted for The following hypothetical argument is confirmatory of this If there were a water pot here it would be seen as the place is seen but it is not seen and consequently there is none Another subsidiary *is stated to* be reminiscence of the past by which is meant recollection of a past and now non existent water pot and the like the recollection of a thing non-existent. U

² The four kinds of non existence being analysed the perception of subsequent *non-existence is analysed* Such percep

---

¹ इदानीं प्रकरणान्तरमारभते तत्र प्रध्वंसे तावत् प्रत्यक्षसामग्रीमाह । असदिती
तिकारेण प्रत्यक्षाकारं ज्ञानमाह तथाहि असन् घटः नष्टो घटः ध्वस्त इदानीं घट इति प्र
त्यक्षप्रतीतिरस्ति तत्र दृष्टान्तो विरोधिप्रत्यक्षादिति विरोधिनो घटादेर्यथा स्पष्टं प्रत्यक्ष
तथा तत्प्रध्वंसस्यापि तत्र कारणमाह भूतप्रत्यक्षाभावादिति भूतस्य उत्पन्नविनष्टस्य
घटादेः प्रत्यक्षाभावात् एतेन योग्यानुपलब्धिमाह तत्र चायं तर्कः सहकारी यद्यत्र घटो
ऽभविष्यत् भूतलमिवाद्रक्ष्यत नच दृश्यते तस्मान्नास्तीति सहकार्यन्तरमाह भूतस्मृतेरिति
भूतस्य प्रतियोगिप्रतियोगिनो घटादेः स्मृतेरिति प्रतियोगिस्मरणमुक्तम् ॥

² अभावचतुष्टयं व्युत्पाद्य ध्वंसप्रत्यक्षं व्युत्पादयति । असदिति असन् घटः नष्टो
घटः ध्वस्तो घट इत्यादिप्रत्यक्षं विरोधिप्रत्यक्षवत् प्रतियोगिघटप्रत्यक्षवत् अनुभवसिद्ध
लौकिकसन्निकर्षजन्यञ्चेत्यर्थः तत्र च प्रतियोगिप्रत्यक्षं चक्षुरादिसंयोगजन्यं ध्वंसप्रत्यक्षन्तु
चक्षुरादिसंयुक्तविशेषणताजन्यमिति विशेषः अपरमपि विशेषमाह भूतप्रत्यक्षाभावादिति
भूतस्य अतीतस्य प्रतियोगिनो घटादेः प्रत्यक्षस्याभावात् योग्यानुपलम्भरूपात् कारणात् भू
तस्य अतीतघटादेः स्मृतेः स्मरणात्मकात् प्रतियोगिज्ञानाच्च जायमानमिति पूरणीयम्
तथाच ध्वंसप्रत्यक्षं प्रतियोग्यनुपलब्धिजन्यं प्रतियोगिज्ञानजन्यञ्च प्रतियोगिप्रत्यक्षन्तु न
तथा इत्यपि विशेष इति भावः अत्र स्मृतिस्वरूपविषयकत्वं ज्ञानमात्रन्तु विवक्षितमिति म
न्तव्यम् । एवञ्च घटादयो यथा प्रत्यक्षसिद्धास्तथा तद्ध्वंसा अपीति भावः ॥

tions as that a thing is non existent, a water-pot is non existent, a water pot is destroyed a water-pot has ceased to be, are like the perception of the repugnant, that is like the perception of a not now existing water-pot given by experience or produced by ordinary contact (of subject and object) Of these, perception of an object non existent is produced by conjunction with the eye &c, while perception of emergent non existence is produced by determination related to the eye &c. Such is one difference, another is stated to be that the perception of subsequent non existence results from non-existence of past perception that is from a cause in the form of possible non apprehension consequent on non existence of perception of a past foregone now non existent water pot, and also from a reminiscence of a past water pot &c. that is from a cognition, which is a recollection, of a non existent object The perception, therefore, of subsequent non existence is produced by non apprehension of a non existent object and by knowledge of a non existent object, but the perception of a non existent object is not so, there being a difference V

तथा ऽभावे भावप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 Likewise also from perception of existence in non existence.

[1] The word non existence, through expressive of non existence in general is ascertained from the context to denote antecedent non existence or potential existence. There is then a perceptive knowledge of antecedent non existence as there is of emergent non existence Why? Because there is a perception of existence, a perception of the straws in course of weaving (into a mat,

[1] सामान्यवाच्यप्यभावशब्दः प्रकरणात प्रागभावपर यथा प्रध्वंसे प्रत्यक्षज्ञानं तथा प्रागभावेऽपि कुतः भावप्रत्यक्षत्वात भावस्य व्यूयमानवीरणादेः प्रत्यक्षत्वात् प्रत्यक्षेण विषयीक्रियमाणत्वात् यद्वा भावस्याधिकरणस्य प्रतियोगिनश्च प्रत्यक्षत्वात् योग्यत्यादित्यर्थः संसर्गाभावप्रदेऽधिकरणयोग्यतायाः प्रतियोगियोग्यतायाश्च तन्त्रत्वात घटात् प्रतियोगिस्मरणसुक्तस्य तर्कं समुच्चिनोति अनादेरपि प्रागभावस्यानन्तस्यापि प्रध्वंसस्यावस्थापियेपमात्रे प्रत्यक्षत्वम ॥

which is potentially existent in them) these being made the object of perception Or it may mean that the perception of antecedent non existence results from the perception or perceptibility of existence that is of the substratum and the object therein non existent since perceptibility of the substratum and of the object non existent is the condition of apprehension of general non-existence The particle *also* implies recollection of the absent non existent object and the hypothetical reasoning aforesaid Antecedent non existence *without beginning also and emergent non existence without end* are perceptible only under particular circumstances U

[1] There being a restriction of the general term non existence to antecedent non existence so is there also of perception. There is a perceptive knowledge of antecedent as of subsequent non-existence by *means of experience rendered possible* by apposition of the sense-organ and its object and of knowledge of the non-existent It may be asked Inasmuch as antecedent non existence has no beginning how is it that there is no perception of it long before the production of conjunction of the two halves of a water jar &c. the forementioned causes of such perception being possible at that time also? It is therefore stated that such perception results from perception of existence The affix *ghan* (in the word *bhava*, 'existence) denotes the material cause the source of being Existence is the ultimate sum of conditions or causal apparatus and that only is perceptible which is perceptible thereby, inasmuch as it must be manifested by the ultimate causal apparatus Such is the resultant meaning of the aphorism It is to be considered that

[1] अभावे प्रागभावे सामान्यवाचकशब्दस्य विशेषपरत्वात् तथा प्रत्यक्षम् यथा ध्वंसे इन्द्रियसन्निकर्षयोग्यानुपलब्धिप्रतियोगिज्ञाने प्रत्यक्षं जायते तथा प्रागभावेऽपीत्यर्थः । ननु प्रागभावस्यानादित्वात् कपालादिसंयोगजननादतिपूर्वमपि कथं न प्रागभावस्य प्रत्यक्षमुक्तानां कारणानां तदानीमपि सम्भवादित्यत आह। भावप्रत्यक्षत्वादिति भवत्यस्मादित्युपादाने घञ् भावश्चरमकारणसामग्री तेन प्रत्यक्षं यस्य तस्मात् चरमकारणसामग्र्यपेक्षत्वादितिफलितार्थः तथाचोक्तस्थले चरमकारणसामग्र्यभावान्न प्रागभावप्रत्यक्षमिति भाव अतीन्द्रियस्य वाय्वादेः प्रागभावस्य प्रत्यक्षकारणाय चकारस्तेन च प्रतियोगियोग्यत्वं समुच्चितमिति मन्तव्यम् ॥

the particle *also* is added to prevent the supposition of perception of supersensible antecedent non-existence of air &c , and that perceptibility as an absent object is thereby additionally implied V.

एतेनाघटोऽगौरधर्मश्च व्याख्यातः ॥ ८ ॥

-Aph 8 *Hereby are explained the negations not a water-pot, not a cow, and demerit*

[1] The perceptibility of reciprocal non-existence, is declared The word Hereby suggests recollection of the absent object, apprehension of the substratum (or site of the absent object), and the forementioned hypothetical reasoning Non-observation of the perceptible is common to all these cases, the particle *and* implying the aforesaid addition *By the word demerit, while the perceptibility* of reciprocal non existence of merit, though supersensible, in its substratum or site, knowledge, pleasure &c is affirmed, *it is at the same time declared that perceptibility of the absent object* is not a condition of the apprehension of reciprocal non-existence, and thus it is suggested that the perceptibility of the substratum *(or site of the absent object)* is the only *requisite of* such apprehension How else could there be apprehended reci-

[1] अन्योन्याभावस्य प्रत्यक्षतामाह । एतेनेति प्रतियोगिस्मरणाधिकरणग्रहणप्रागुक्ततर्कानतिदिशति योग्यानुपलम्भः सर्वत्र समानः चकार उक्तसमुच्चयार्थः अधर्म इत्यतोन्द्रियस्यापि धर्मस्य सुखज्ञानाद्यधिकरणेऽन्योन्याभावस्य प्रत्यक्षता वदन् अन्योन्याभावग्रहे प्रतियोगियोग्यता न तन्त्रं किन्त्वधिकरणयोग्यतामात्रं तन्त्रमित्युपदर्शयति कथमन्यथा स्तम्भः पिशाचो न भवतीति पिशाचान्योन्याभावः स्तम्भे गृह्येत स्तम्भात्मतया पिशाचानुपलम्भस्य तदन्योन्याभावग्राहकत्वात् तस्याप्यनुपलम्भस्य प्रतियोगिसत्त्वविरोधित्वात् स्तम्भे पिशाचतादात्म्ये सत्यनुपलम्भानुपपत्तेः । ननु पिशाचतादात्म्यमिह न प्रतियोगि किन्तर्हि पिशाचः स च स्तम्भे वर्तमानोऽपि गुरुत्ववन्नोपलभ्यते इति तदनुपलम्भः प्रतियोगिसत्त्वविरोधी न भवतीति चेन्न प्रतियोग्यनुपलम्भवत् प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकानुपलम्भस्याप्यभावग्राहकत्वात् ननु प्रतियोगित्वपदार्थोऽन्योन्याभावपक्षे प्रतियोगिस्वरूपान्योन्याभावविरहात्मत्वं ततश्चान्योन्याभावपक्षाधीन एवान्योन्याभावग्रह इति चेन्नाधिकरणावृत्तित्वेन ज्ञायमानो धर्मो यत्र प्रतियोगितावच्छेदको ननु प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकस्वेनापि तद्ग्रहस्तन्त्रमित्युक्तत्वात् ॥

procal negation of a fiend in a post, when it it is recognised that that a post is not a fiend? For since non-apprehension of the fiend as identical with the post, causes apprehension of their reciprocal non existence and since that same non-apprehension is repugnant to the existence of the absent object it would be impossible were the post identical with a fiend, that there should be such non-apprehension It may argued Identity with a fiend is not in this instance the absent object, may it then be the fiend? and supposing him though being in the post, to be, like its gravity, not apprehended, then the non apprehension of him will not be repugnant to the existence of the absent object We reply that this argument is invalid, for non perception of that of which the essential characteristic is the being an absent object is like non observation of the absent object, a cause of apprehension of non existence If it be urged that reciprocal non-existence depends on the apprehension of the absence of an object, that absence of an object (or the state of an object which is non existent) is identity with exemption from reciprocal non existence, we reply that this is not the case for it is an attribute which is cognised as non-existent in any given substratum that has for its essential characteristic the nature of being an absent object but the condition of the perception of that attribute is not the having for its essential characteristic the nature of being an absent object U

[1] *The recognition of reciprocal non existence the form of*

---

[1] अघट पट अगौरवः अधर्मं सुखमित्याद्याकारकोऽन्योन्याभावप्रत्ययोऽपि एतेन ध्वंसप्रागभावप्रत्ययकथनेन व्याख्यातः कथित इति समुदितार्थः तथाचान्योन्याभावप्रत्यक्षेऽपि इन्द्रियसम्बद्धविशेषणता प्रतियोग्यनुपलम्भः प्रतियोगितावच्छेदकानि कारणानि स्युः परं विशेषो यत् संसर्गाभावप्रत्यक्षे प्रतियोगियोग्यत्वं तन्त्रम् अन्योन्याभावप्रत्यक्षे त्वधिकरणयोग्यत्वमिति धर्मस्यातीन्द्रियत्वेऽपि सुखादौ योग्याधिकरणे तदन्योन्याभावस्य प्रत्यक्षमिराबाधमेवेति यत्तु संसर्गाभावप्रत्यक्षे प्रतियोग्यधिकरणोभययोग्यत्वं तन्त्रमिति कैश्चिदुक्तं तन्न समीचीनं तथा सति पाषाणे सौरभाभावस्य गुडे तिक्ताभावस्य वायौ रूपाभावस्य आकाशे स्पर्शाभावस्य शब्दाभावस्य च प्रत्यक्षानुपपत्तेस्तत्तदधिकरणानां तत्तदिन्द्रियायोग्यत्वात् अतएव स्पर्शसंयुक्तकालविशेषणतया वायुस्पर्शनाशप्रत्यक्षं पक्षधरमिश्रैः स्वीकृतमिति संक्षेपः ॥

which recognition is such as that a piece of cloth is not a water-pot, a horse is not a cow, pleasure is not demerit has been already explained by the description of the perception of emergent and of antecedent non existence Such is the sense of the aphorism as a whole. The causes then of the apprehension of reciprocal non existence are possession of characters in relation with the sense organs, non observation of the absent object and cognition of the absent object The greatest difference is that the perceptibility of the absent object is the condition of apprehension of general non existence, whereas it is the perceptibility of the substratum that is the condition of apprehension of reciprocal non existence Thus though merit be a supersensible thing there is no impossibility in perceiving its reciprocal non existence in pleasure &c its sensible substratum Whereas some have taught that perceptibility of both the absent object and its substratum or site is requisite to the apprehension of general non existence this is untrue inasmuch as were this the case the perception of non existence of fragrance in a stone of non existence of bitterness in treacle of non existence of colour in air and of non existence of touch and sound in ether would be impossible since the respective substrata are not perceptible to the several sense-organs It was from this consideration that Paksha dhara Miśra maintained the perception of the destruction or cessation of the touch of the air characterised by time conjunct with the skin (the organ of touch) V

अभूत नास्तीत्यनर्थान्तरम् ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 [The negation] *Is not* designates nought else than that which has not been

[1] The recognition that what has been no longer is reposes upon emergent non-existence and is not conversant about the

[1] भूतमिदानीं नास्तीतिप्रतीतिर्ध्वंसमालम्बते भूतस्य नेदानीमस्तित्वमिति मा स्तीतिमात्रेऽल्येतिनो प्रत्यक्षप्रतीतिरत्यन्ताभावमालम्बते अभूतमित्युत्पादविनाशानास्पदत्वं द्योतयति अनर्थान्तरत्वमपि तदभिप्रायकमेव यथा जल पृथिवीत्वं नास्ति पृथि

having been, while the recognition by perception simply that such and such a thing is not, rests upon absolute non existence The expression that which has not been points out independence of production and destruction. Designating nought else means purporting that only For example There exists not in water terrestriality There exists not in earth aqueousness for if there existed terrestriality in that whereof the particles are aqueous it would be observed, whereas it is not observed, wherefore it is not,—a reference to such arguments is to be observed in this aphorism. Thus we must hold that there is non existence of an object where such object will never be and has never been. The recognition that an object is not relates to the substratum and is the support of emergent and antecedent non-existence, of that which has been and will be therein Hence it is that this absolute non-existence is designated as of trinal time U

नास्ति घटो गेहे इति सतो घटस्य गेहसंसर्गप्रतिषेध ॥१०॥

Aph 10 [The proposition] that there is not a water pot in a house is a negation of connection between an existent water-pot and the house

[1] It may be urged that non-existence of a water pot in any given house is not absolute non existence inasmuch as a water pot exists sometimes there, nor is it antecedent or emergent non-existence, inasmuch as these reside only in material causes, nor is it absolute non existence characterised as production and destruction,

---

त्वं न जलत्वमिति यदि हि जलावयविनि पृथिवीत्व स्यात उपलभ्येत नचोपलभ्यते तस्मान्नास्तीतितर्कपुरस्कारोऽत्रापि द्रष्टव्य । एवञ्च यद्वस्तु यत्र न कदापि भविष्यति नच कदाचिद्भूतं तस्य वस्तुनस्तत्रात्यन्ताभावो मन्तव्य । भूतभविष्यतोश्च तत्र प्रध्वंस प्रागभावलम्बनं एव तत्राधिकरणे नास्तीतिप्रत्यय । अतएवायमात्यन्तिकस्त्रैकालिक इत्यभिधीयते ॥

[1] ननु गेहे घटाभावो नात्यन्ताभाव कदाचित्तत्र घटसत्त्वात् नापि प्रागभावप्रध्वंसौ तयो समवायिकारणमात्रवृत्तित्वात नाप्युत्पादविनाशशीलोऽत्यन्ताभाव एव आत्यन्तिकस्योत्पादविनाशशीलत्वेति विरोधात नापि चतुर्थ एवाय संसर्गाभाव तस्य त्रैविध्यविभागव्याघातादित्यत आह ॥

since there is a contradiction between the absolute and that which comes into being and ceases to be, nor is this the fourth kind of non existence general non existence inasmuch as that is repugnant to the threefold division Accordingly this aphorism is stated U

आत्मन्यात्ममनसोः संयोगविशेषादात्मप्रत्यक्षम् ॥ ११ ॥

Aph 11 Perception of the soul [results] from a particular conjunction between the soul and the internal organ in the soul

[1] Common perception of existence and non existence having been described, another section is commenced with the purpose of describing the perception of ascetics The words cognition is produced, are to be supplied. Ascetics are of two kinds, those who have meditated on the internal organ and are called united and those who have not meditated on the internal organ and are called disunited Of these the united having reverently fixed their mind on the object to be presented to it are engaged in meditation, and in them cognition of soul whether of their own soul or of that of others, is produced Perception of soul is that cognition wherein the soul is the percept or object of presentation Although there is in ourselves and others occasionally a cognition of spirit, this being obscured by nescience has been declared to be virtually non existent From a particular conjunction between the soul and the internal organ means from that particular contiguity between the soul and the internal organ which is the mental state produced by union [with infinite spirit] U

[1] सदेव भावाभावविषयं लौकिकप्रत्यक्षं निरूप्य योगिप्रत्यक्षं निरूपयितुं प्रकरणान्तरमारभते। ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते इति शेषः द्विविधास्तावद्योगिनः समाहितान्तःकरणा ये युक्ता इत्यभिधीयन्ते असमाहितान्तःकरणाश्च ये वियुक्ता इत्यभिधीयन्ते तत्र युक्ताः साक्षात्कर्तव्ये वस्तुन्यादरेण मनो निधाय निदिध्यासनवन्तः तेषामात्मनि स्वात्मनि परात्मनि च ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते आत्मप्रत्यक्षमिति आत्मा प्रत्यक्षं साक्षात्कारविषयो यत्र ज्ञाने तत्तथा यद्यप्यस्मदादीनामपि कदाचिदात्मज्ञानमस्ति तथाप्यविद्यातिरस्कृतत्वात् तदसत्कल्पमित्युक्तमात्ममनसोः सन्निकर्षविशेषादिति योगजधर्मानुग्रह आत्ममनसोः संनिकर्षो विशेषस्तस्मादित्यर्थः ॥

तथा द्रव्यान्तरेषु प्रत्यक्षम् ॥ १२ ॥

Aph 12 Likewise perception of other substances

[1] It might be asked how, if the knowledge of those who are united be of the soul only, they can possess omniscience Accordingly the aphorism is stated The words Cognition is produced are implied by the nature of the topic There is, therefore, by means of the internal organ accompanied with the merit acquired by asceticism perception of other subtances, that is, of the four atomic substances, of the internal organ air, space, time and ether The term substance comprehends the qualities actions, and universal entities residing in substance, the category of particularity, co inherence, gravity, elasticity &c residing in perception, and spontaneous activity, indiscriminative mental retenta, merit and demerit residing in the soul. For the possession of the merit produced by asceticism is equivalent to a perceptive apparatus, otherwise omniscience would not be affirmed of those ascetics who are said to be united U

असमाहितान्तःकरणा उपसंहृतसमाधयस्तेषाञ्च ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 In those also whose internal organ is not meditative, and in those whose meditation is consummated [there is perception of soul &c.]

[2] Those whose internal organ is not meditative, are those whose inner sense is destitute of meditation, and they whose me-

---

[1] ननु किमात्मन्येव युक्तानां ज्ञानं तत् कुतः सार्वज्ञ्यमित्यत आह । ज्ञानमुत्पद्यत इति प्रकरणात्प्राप्तम् तथेति योगजधर्मानुगृहीतेन मनसा द्रव्यान्तरेषु चतुर्ष्वणुषु मनसि वायुदिक्कालाकाशेषु द्रव्यपदेन तद्गतगुणकर्मसामान्यानां विशेषपदार्थस्य समवायस्य प्रत्यक्षगतस्यापि गुरुत्वस्थितिस्थापकादेरात्मगतस्यापि जीवनयोनियत्ननिर्विकल्पकभावना धर्माधर्मादेः संग्रहः सामग्री योगजधर्मोपग्रहस्य तुल्यत्वात् अन्यथा सार्वज्ञ्यमुक्तं न भवेत् ॥

[2] असमाहितान्तःकरणाः असमाहितं समाधिरहितम् अन्तःकरणं येषां ते तथा उपसंहृत समापित सफलीकृत समाधिर्यैस्ते समाधेः फलविविधाः सिद्धयस्ताः येषामुत्पन्नास्तादृशाः ये युक्तास्तेषामपि आत्मनाम् अन्येषां द्रव्याणाञ्च प्रत्यक्षं भवतीति समुदितार्थः युञ्जानस्य प्रत्यक्षे ध्यानापेक्षा युक्तस्य प्रत्यक्षे तु ध्यानात्मकसमाध्यपेक्षा नास्तीति भावः ॥

ditation is consummated, perfected or rendered fruitful, in whom are produced the various perfections which are the fruit of meditation attain perception of souls and other substances Such is the sense to be gathered from the aphorism In fine the ascetic who is in course of *union requires contemplation*, while he who is united has no need of meditation which is identical with contemplation V

तत्समवायात् कर्मगुणेषु ॥ १४ ॥

Aph 14 [Perception] of actions and qualities [arises] from co-inherence therein

[1] It might be urged that omniscience is not possible in an ascetic for though there be perception of substances there is no such cognition of qualities and actions. *To this the reply is furnished.* From co inherence therein, that is in conjunction with the internal organ assisted by merit acquired by asceticism there is produced in the ascetic, whether in course of union or united the perception of qualities and actions For the efficacy of the merit acquired by asceticism is inconceivable *By the power thereof the sage* Agastya drank up the ocean, Saurabhi assumed a multitude of bodies and Vasishtha *discovered the curse of Dilipa by Surabhi* The production therefore by merit acquired by asceticism, of presentation of all the categories is not impossible. The term actions and qualities involves more and universality &c. is to be understood In a like manner we are to understand perception effected by supersensual cognition in the form of general implication, and implication of cognition V

---

[1] ननु द्रव्य एव प्रत्यक्षसम्भवेऽपि सर्वज्ञत्वं योगिनोऽनुपपन्नमेव गुणादीनामज्ञानादत आह । तस्य योगजधर्मसहकृतमनःसंयोगस्य समवायात् युक्तयुञ्जानयोः कर्मसु गुणेषु च प्रत्यक्षमुत्पद्यते इत्यर्थः अचिन्त्यो हि योगजधर्मप्रभावः यद्बलेनागस्त्यमुनिः पारावारं पपौ सौभरिश्च कायव्यूहं परिगृहीतवान् वशिष्ठश्च दिलीपस्य सुरभिशापं ज्ञातवान् तस्य योगजधर्मस्य पदार्थसार्थसाक्षात्कारसम्पादनं नासम्भावनीयमिति कर्मगुणेत्युपलक्षणं सामान्यादिकमपि बोध्यम् एवं सामान्यलक्षणाज्ञानलक्षणारूपालौकिकप्रत्यासत्तिजन्यं प्रत्यक्षमप्यूहनीयम् ॥

[1] आत्मसमवायादात्मगुणेषु ॥ १५ ॥

Aph 15 [Perception] of the attributes of the soul [arises] from co inherence in soul

[1] *This aphorism is stated Inasmuch as it might be asked* whether ascetics have not also the common perception The conclusion gathered is that there arises in ascetics also the common perception of the attributes of the soul that is, of pleasure and the other attributes which reside in the soul from co inherence in soul that is from co inherence in the soul conjoined with the internal organ, being accomplished by that as its instrument. V

SECOND DAILY LESSON

अस्येदं कार्यं कारणं संयोगि विरोधि समवायि चेति लैङ्गिकम् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Inferential cognition is that one thing is the effect or cause of conjunct with repugnant to or co inherent in another

[1] *In the preceding daily lesson the perception of ascetics* and of non ascetics was described according to its cause its nature and its characteristic Assurance having been formerly divided into perceptive and inferential the description of inferential assurance is here commenced The term cognition is to be supplied being the subject treated of *Inferential knowledge is that which is pro*duced from a mark or middle term The mark is that attribute of the subject of the conclusion which is characterised by pervasion Pervasion is said to exist therein The subject is that wherein there is non existence of assurance repugnant to that which there is desire to prove Such assurance is proof and disproof for the minor term is that wherein there is non existence of both proof and

[1] ननु किं योगिनां लौकिकप्रत्यक्षं न भवतीत्यत आह । आत्मसमवायात् मनःसंयुक्तात्मसमवायात् आत्मगुणेषु सुखादिगुणेषु योगिनां लौकिकमपि प्रत्यक्षं भवति तत्साधनत्वादिति समुदितनिष्कर्षः ॥

[2] तदेवं पूर्वाह्निके योगिप्रत्यक्षमयोगिप्रत्यक्षञ्च कारणतः स्वरूपतो लक्षणतश्च निरूपितम् प्रमाणं द्विविधं प्रत्यक्षं लैङ्गिकञ्चेति यदुक्तं तत्र लैङ्गिकमिदानीं निरूपयितुमुपक्रमते । ज्ञानमिति प्रकृतम् लिङ्गाज्जातं लैङ्गिकं व्याप्तिविशिष्टं पक्षधर्मो लिङ्गम् तत्र

disproof For where there exists probative or disprobative assurance, no one feels uncertainty or desire of demonstration The ancients therefore defined the subject of the question to be an object possessing the attributes of the predecate uncertainly, or an object the possession whereby of the attributes of the major is required to be proved According to Jivanátha Miśra the subject is that wherein there is non-existence of probation obstructive to the genesis of doubt terminable by decision of the possible comprehension of the major Some hold that the subject is that wherein there is non-existence of demonstrative evidence backed by absence of desire of proof According to this doctrine the nature of a subject would exist even in the case of repugnancy This then may be seen in

---

व्यतिरिक्ता यस्सिषाधयिषाविरोधिप्रमाणाभावो यत्र स त प्रति पक्ष तद्दृश प्रमाण साधक बाधकञ्च तदुभयाभाववत पक्षत्वात् नहि साधके बाधके वा प्रमाणे सति कस्यचित् सशय सिषाधयिषा वा अतएव सन्दिग्धसाध्यधर्मा धर्मी सिषाधयिषितसाध्यधर्मा धर्मी वा पक्ष इति प्राञ्च उत्पाद्यसाध्यवत्तानिर्णयनिवर्त्यसशयोत्पत्तिप्रतिबन्धकमानत्वावच्छिन्नाभावो यत्र स पक्ष इति जीवनाथमिश्रा सिषाधयिषाविरहसहकृतसाधकमानाभावो यत्र स पक्ष इति केचित एतन्मते बाधस्थलेऽपि पक्षता तदेतदनुमानमयूखे द्रष्टव्यम तदेतस्य पक्षस्य धर्मो लिङ्गमित्युक्त भवति लिङ्गञ्च दृष्टमनुमित श्रुत वा यदनुभवरूप ज्ञान जनयति तल्लैङ्गिक तदुक्तम अनुमेयेन सम्बद्ध प्रसिद्धञ्च तदन्विते। तदभावे तु नास्त्येव तल्लिङ्गमनुमापकम्। इति एतेन लिङ्गमेवानुमितिकरण नतु तस्य परामर्श तस्य निर्व्यापारत्वेनाकरणत्वात् लिङ्गस्य तु स एव व्यापार यत्र धूमादेरतीतत्वमनागतत्व वा तत्र कथमनुमितिरिति चेन्न साध्यस्याप्यतीतानागतत्वयोस्तत्रानुमानात् तत्रैव प्रतिबन्धात् अतीतत्वमनागतत्व वर्त्तमानत्वञ्च धूमादेर्यत्र न निश्चित तत्र कथमनुमितिरिति चेत न कथञ्चित तत्र साध्यस्यापि सन्देहात पूर्वापरदिनयो सत्त्वनिश्चये मध्यदिने तु सन्देहे कथमनुमितिरिति चेत तद्दिनावच्छिन्नधूमादिना तद्दिनावच्छिन्नवह्नेरनुमानात तथैव व्याप्त कारणस्यावधारणात धूलीपटलात कथ धूमभ्रमादनुमितिरिति चेत व्याप्तत्वेन ज्ञातस्यैव लिङ्गत्वात ज्ञानस्य च याथार्थ्यायाथार्थ्याभ्यामनुमितस्ताद्रूप्यात् अन्यथा तथापि कथ तत्र परामर्श करण स्यात अतीन्द्रियलिङ्गस्थले परामर्शस्य तदजन्यतया कथ तद्व्यापारत्वमिति चेत तत्सत्तानिर्वाहकत्वरूपवैभिकसाधनतायास्तत्र व्यापारत्वघटकत्वात अन्यथा समवायस्य घटादेर्व्यापारत्वानुपपत्तेरिति कार्यात्लिङ्गात धूमालोकादेरग्न्याद्यनुमान कारणादपि यथा बधिरस्य भेरीदण्डसयोगविशेषात् शब्दानुमानम यथा वा धार्मिकस्य यथाविधियागस्नानाद्यनुष्ठानाद्धर्मस्वर्गाद्यनुमानम यथाविधिकारीर्याद्यनुष्ठानाद्वा वर्षानुमानम् यथ पूर्णनद्यादौ खन्यमानप्रवाहाद्वा जलनिःसरणानुमानम् उपरि वृष्टिदर्शनाद्वा नदीवृद्ध्यनुमानम सचाय कार्यकारणभावलक्षण एकसम्बन्धप्रकारद्वयेनोक्त सयोगिन शरीरस्य दर्शनात्त्वगिन्द्रियानुमानम विरोधिनो विस्फूर्जता छेदेर्धनाजभाटाद्यन्तरितनकुलानुमानम समवायिना जलोष्ण्येन तत्सम्बद्धतेजोऽनुमानम् ॥

the Anumána-mayúkha. The attribute of this subject is called the mark or argument The mark is that which being seen, inferred, or heard, produces cognition, other than memory, and this cognition is inferential. Hence it has been said That which is connected with the inferrible, and which is generally known as in the concomitant, but in the absence thereof, there is no illative argument It is, therefore the mark which is the instrument of illation, not the sumption, inasmuch as that not having the function, cannot be an instrument, whereas this function belongs to the *mark or argument*

If it be asked how, where smoke &c the argument is past or future, there can be illation; we reply that this is no valid objection as in this case we infer that the designate of the predicate of the conclusion also as past or future If it be asked how there can be illation where, in consequence of an impediment in the case, it is not ascertained whether the smoke &c., be past, future or present, we admit that there can in no wise be such illation inasmuch as there is uncertainty in such an instance also as to the major If it be asked how an illation can take place where there is certainty as to a previous and a following day, and uncertainty as to the intermediate day, we reply, that it results from inferring the existence of fire &c, limited to those days from smoke &c limited to those days in consequence of observing such causality in the pervasion or invariable concomitance asserted in *the sumption* It it be asked how *illation results from a column* of dust mistaken for smoke, we reply that it is because that which is understood to be pervaded (i e. the column of dust supposed to be smoke and therefore pervaded by fire), is the mark or middle *term*, and because *the inference is correct or incorrect according* to the correctness or incorrectness of such experience (the logical, not involving the material, truth), else how should your own sumption be the instrument in such a case If it be asked how in the *case of a supersensible mark, the sumption not being pro-*

ducible thereby the mark can have such a function, we reply that it is because the existence of a practical argument demonstrative of the reality thereof effects the function in such an instance, else it would not be possible that there should exist in hearing &c, the function of co-inherence.

Inference results *from* a mark which is an effect as the inference of fire &c from smoke light &c., also from a mark which is a cause as where a deaf man *infers* a sound *from* a particular conjunction of a drum with the drumstick, or where a righteous man *infers merit* paradise &c *from* the due *performance of sacrifice*, ablution &c, or where rain is inferred from the due performance of a sacrifice in which the fruit of the Capparis Aphylla is employed, or where the efflux of water is inferred from a channel which men are digging out from a river *full of water* or *the inference of* the rising of a stream from the observation of rain overhead. This single connection then *characterised as the relation of* cause and effect has been stated in two ways. Inference from a conjunct object is such as *inference of the organ of touch from observation* of an animal body. Inference from a repugnant object is such as *inference of* an ichneumon concealed by bushes &c *from* observation of an excited snake. Inference from a co-inherent object is such as the *inference* of *fire* connected with water *from* the heat of the water U

अस्येदं कार्यकारणसम्बन्धश्चावयवाद्भवति ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 That one thing belongs to another the connection of cause and effect arises from a portion

[1] This aphorism is stated to meet the objection that this distribution of middle terms is inexhaustive, since it does not include the inference of the heaving of the ocean from the rising of the moon the rise of Canopus from the tranquillity of the waters the

[1] न्यूनत्वापत्तिरिदं परिगणनम् नहि चन्द्रोदयेन समुद्रवृद्धेः जलप्रसादेनाग स्त्योदयस्य कुमुदविकासेन चन्द्रोदयस्य चतुर्दशचन्द्रोदयनापरचतुर्दशमहत्त्वासम्भवस्य इति

rising of the moon from the expansion of the Nymphæa the setting of fourteen of the lunar mansions from the rising of the other fourteen, of colour from taste or of a particular taste from a particular colour The words That one thing belongs to another express the cause, the meaning being that this fire &c. to be inferred, belongs to this smoke &c the inferential mark, or that this pervaded smoke &c belongs to this pervading fire &c *It is therefore, the observation of pervasion generally that is the condition of illation, not the relation of cause and effect &c* The words The connection of cause and effect are added lest it might be objected that the enumeration in the preceding aphorism is consequently irregular, and by these the other connections also are implied The term connection has a subjective implication, and therefore

---

रूपस्य रूपविशेषेण वा रसविशेषस्यानुमानमनेन संगृह्यते इत्यत आह । अस्येदमित्येतावदेव प्रयोजकं भवतीति अस्य साधनस्य धूमादेरिदं साध्यं वह्न्यादि यद्वाऽस्य व्यापकस्य वह्न्यादेरिदं व्याप्यं धूमादि तथाच व्याप्यत्वपदमात्रं तन्त्रं नतु कार्यकारणभावादिरपि ननु पूर्वसूत्रे तर्हि परिसङ्ख्यानमतन्त्रमत आह कार्यकारणसम्बन्ध इति अनेन चोक्तसम्बन्धान्तरमप्युपलक्षयति सम्बन्धपदे च विषयिलक्षणा तेन सम्बन्ध इति सम्बन्धोपन्यास इत्यर्थः । कुतस्तदुपन्यास इत्यत आह अवयवात् एकदेशात् उदाहरणमात्रात् ल्यबलोपे पञ्चमी तेनोदाहरणमनुरुध्य कार्यकारणभावादेः सम्बन्धस्योपन्यास इह दर्शने सांख्यादिदर्शने च भवतीत्यर्थः । एवञ्च स्वाभाविकसम्बन्धशालित्वं व्याप्यत्वम् स्वाभाविकत्वञ्चानौपाधिकत्वम् तच्च प्रत्यक्षाणां केषाञ्चित् साध्याव्यापकत्वनिश्चयात् केषाञ्चित् साधनव्यापकत्वनिश्चयादेवानुपाधित्वं ज्ञेयम् अतीन्द्रियाणाञ्च प्रमाणसिद्धाना केषाञ्चिदुभयव्यापकत्वम् उभयाव्यापकत्वं साधनमात्रव्यापकत्वं साध्यमात्राव्यापकत्वं वा तत्राद्ये साधनव्यापकत्वात् द्वितीये साध्याव्यापकत्वात् चतुर्थेऽपि साधनव्यापकत्वादेवानुपाधित्वं निश्चेयम् । तच्चानुमानं द्विविधं स्वार्थं परार्थञ्च तत्र स्वार्थं स्वयमेव व्याप्तिपक्षधर्मतयोरनुसन्धानात् परार्थञ्च परोदीरितन्यायजन्यव्याप्तिपक्षधर्मताज्ञानात् न्यायश्च तृतीयलिङ्गपरामर्शप्रयोजकशाब्दज्ञानजनकवाक्यम् तदवयवाश्च पञ्च तत्रावयवत्वं तृतीयलिङ्गपरामर्शप्रयोजकशाब्दज्ञानजनकशाब्दज्ञानजनकत्वम् तानि च वाक्यानि प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरणोपनयनिगमनानि तत्र प्रतिज्ञा उद्देश्यानुमित्यन्यूनानतिरिक्तविषयकशाब्दज्ञानजनकं न्यायावयववाक्यम् हेतुश्च प्रकृतसाधनगतपञ्चम्यन्तो न्यायावयवः उदाहरणन्तु प्रकृतसाध्यसाधनाविनाभावप्रतिपादको न्यायावयवः उपनयश्चाविनाभावविशिष्टस्य हेतोः पक्षवैशिष्ट्यप्रतिपादको न्यायावयवः निगमनन्तु पक्षे प्रकृतसाध्यवैशिष्ट्यप्रतिपादको न्यायावयवः एवञ्च प्रवर्तते न्यायः शब्दो नित्यः कृतकत्वात् यद् यत् कृतकं तदनित्यम् अनित्यत्वव्याप्यकृतकत्ववांश्चायम् तस्मादनित्यः । एतेषामेव प्रतिज्ञापदेशनिदर्शनानुसन्धानप्रत्याम्नाया इत्यन्यथा वैशेषिकाणां संज्ञा अत्र च वादजल्पवितण्डानां षट्त्रिंशत्प्रकारच्छलजातिनिग्रहस्थानलक्षणानि च वादिविनोदे द्रष्टव्यानि ॥

means the suggestion of connection It will be asked whence this suggestion arises. It is therefore stated that it arises from a portion, that is from a particular instance or mere example

According, then both to this system and those of the Sânkhyas and others the suggestion of connection whether the relation of cause and effect or other, arises in conformity with the example Thus then pervasion (or the being pervaded, as the mark by that of which it is the mark) is the possession of a natural connection, the natural being that which is not accidental This intrinsic nature is known from its being ascertained that certain perceptible objects do not pervade (or are not invariably concomitant with) that which is to be proved (or that which is denoted by the *major term*), *while it is ascertained that certain perceptible objects* do pervade the inferential mark Of supersensible objects established by evidence some are pervasive of both non pervasive of both pervasive only of the inferential mark, or non pervasive only of that which is to be inferred Among these the non-accidental nature of the first is to be ascertained from their pervading the inferential mark, of the second from their not pervading that which is to be inferred, and of the fourth also from their pervading the inferential mark This inference is is of two kinds, for the sake of oneself (or logical) and for the sake of another (or rhetorical) Of these inference for the sake of oneself arises from investigating for oneself the pervasion or sumption and the determination of the minor by the middle, and inference for the sake of another results from knowledge of the pervasion, and of the qualification of the minor, derived from a syllogism enunciated by another

A syllogism is a sentence which conveys verbal knowledge which is the cause of the third recognition of the inferential mark The members thereof are five, viz, the question, argument, instance application, and conclusion Of these the question is a proposition a member of the syllogism, conveying verbal know-

ledge the object whereof is neither less nor more than the conclusion to be afforded, the *argument* is a member of the syllogism ending in the fifth or ablative case of the middle term under consideration; the instance or example is a member of the syllogism declaratory that the given major is not absent from the middle, the application or subsumption is a member of the syllogism declaratory that the minor is characterised by the middle thus characterised by non absence of the major, and the conclusion is that member of the syllogism which declares the minor to be characterised by the given major The syllogism proceeds as follows Sound is non-eternal (the question), because it is producible (the argument), whatever is producible is non eternal (the instance), and sound is characterised by producibleness pervaded by non-eternity (the application), therefore it is non eternal (the conclusion) The descriptive appellations given by the Vaiśeshikas to these five members, are the question *(pratijná)*, reason *(apadeśa)*, example *(nidarśana)*, application *(anusandhána)*, and conclusion *(pratyámnáya)* The mode of procedure in colloquy, disputation, and controversy, and the definitions of misconstruction, futile reply, and failure in argumentation, may be sought in the Vadi-vinoda. U

एतेन शाब्दं व्याख्यातम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 By this verbal knowledge is explained

[1] Another section is commenced with the view of including under inferential knowledge other forms of evidence. That knowledge which under the name of verbal knowledge, knowledge whereof words are the instrument, is approved by the Naiyáyikas and

[1] प्रमाणान्तराणि लैङ्गिकेऽन्तर्भावयितु प्रकरणान्तरमारभते । शाब्द शब्दकरणक ज्ञानमिदमिति यद्वैयायिकादीनामभिमत तदप्येतेन लैङ्गिकत्वेन लिङ्गप्रभवत्वेनैव व्याख्यात यथा व्याप्तिपक्षधर्मताप्रतिसन्धानाधीन लैङ्गिक यथा शाब्दमपि तथाहि एते. पदार्था मिथःसंसर्गवन्त आकाङ्क्षादिमद्भि स्मारितत्वात गामभ्याजेति पदार्थसार्थवत् तत्र हि आकाङ्क्षादिमत्पदकदम्बस्मारितत्व पदार्थाना मिथ संसर्गवत्त्वव्याप्य गृहीत्वैव संसर्गवत्त्वमनुमिनोति ॥

others, is explained by this, by the nature of illation, that is, as derived *from* an inferential mark. Verbal knowledge, like inferential, requires consideration of pervasion or invariable concomitance and of the nature of the attributes of the subject of the question. For example, such and such verbal meanings are mutually connected, inasmuch as they are recalled by terms involving an ellipse &c. as in the aggregate of verbal meaning, Drive the cow hither. In this instance a man infers the mutual connection on recognising that there is something recalled by a plurality of terms requiring others to complete the sense, pervaded by mutual connection of the meaning of the terms. U.

[1] By this by the explanation of inferential knowledge, verbal knowledge or cognition produced by knowledge of words, is explained. The Naiyayikas and others hold that there is a kind of experiential cognition termed apprehension of construction, differing both from perception and inference. In the teaching of the Vaiśeshikas this is not admitted. In the case of verbal knowledge they hold that what takes place is inference regarding contiguity of the senses of terms. For instance upon hearing the proposition The cow exists it is inferred that the cow is characterised by existence, inasmuch as this is recalled by the term wherein resides implication of words to be supplied favourable to apprehension of construction characterised by the notion of existence in the proper object qualified, as in the familiar instance of a water pot, or the inference results from what is recalled by the term *cow* this term being uttered together with *exists* as in the case of the eye, but there is no peculiar kind of cognition produced by words. For

[1] एतेन लैङ्गिकज्ञानकथनेन शाब्दं शब्दज्ञानजन्यज्ञानमपि व्याख्यातं कथितमित्यर्थः. नैयायिकप्रभृतिभिरन्वयबोधनामकं प्रत्यक्षानुमितिभिन्नमनुभवरूपं ज्ञानं मन्यते वैशेषिकमते तु न तदङ्गीकारः पदज्ञानस्थले पदार्थसंसर्गस्यानुमितिरेव भवति तथाहि गौरस्तीति वाक्यश्रवणान्तरं गौरस्तितावान् स्वधर्मिकास्तित्वान्वयबोधानुकूलाकाङ्क्षायपदस्मारितत्वात् घटवत् अस्तिपदसमभिव्याहृतगोपदस्मारितत्वाद्वा चक्षुर्वदित्यनुमानमेव ननु शब्दजन्यो विलक्षणोबोधः पदानामेकवाक्यतायवत्त्वकपसमभिव्याहृतत्वनिश्चयं विना न्यायनयेऽप्यन्वयबोधस्यानुत्पत्त्या पूर्वं तस्यावश्यकत्वात् ॥

gayal, occasions a sense of the nature of a gayal it having no other function since it has been applied to that object by the ancients just as the term cow is the occasion of a sense of the nature of a cow Or it may be that the occasion of the sense of the nature of a gayal appears *from the force of* the attribution concerning the subject of the question by means of the inference that the term gayal is an occasion of a practical acceptation inasmuch as it is a legitimate term

The Mimánsakas hold that disjunctive reasoning is another form of evidence For instance when it has been ascertained from astrology that Deva-datta *is to live for a hundred years* and from observation that he has no house to live in it is next presumed that inasmuch as his living a hundred years is otherwise impossible he must live in the open air This as being a fact of implication is not accepted by them as an inference In this example inasmuch as the notion of living involves the notion of living either in a house or in the open air and inasmuch as it is impossible that he should live in a house the other alternative being established his living in the open air appears in the process of illation In like manner in the *familiar example* Deva datta is stout but does not eat by day (therefore he eats at night), it being settled that he must eat since stoutness is observed to be pervaded or universally accompanied by eating and it being con

पीनत्वस्य भोजनव्याप्यत्वावगमादभोजन सिद्धवत दिवाभोजनबाधे रात्रिभोजन सिध्यति । एव सम्भवैतिह्ययोरपि प्रमाणान्तरत्व मन्यन्ते पौराणिका तथाहि सम्भवो भूयसहचाराधीनज्ञान यथा सम्भवति ब्राह्मणे विद्या सम्भवति सहस्रे शतमत्र च व्याप्तिर्नोपलक्षितेति तत्प्रामाण्य एवमितिह्यमिति होचुरित्यनेन प्रकारेण यदुच्यते तद्धि अनिर्दिष्टप्रवक्तृक परम्परागत वाक्य यथा वटे वटे यक्ष इत्यादि तस्याप्रोक्तत्वानिश्चयाच्च शब्देन्तर्भाव इति पौराणिकानभिसन्धि तदेतन्मत न समीचीनम ऐतिह्यस्य शब्दरूपतयाऽनुमान एवान्तर्भावात् सम्भवोऽपि व्याप्तिसापेक्षोऽनुमान एवान्तर्भवति तन्निरपेक्षस्तु प्रमाणमेव न तदुक्त गौतमीये शब्द ऐतिह्यानर्थान्तरभावादनुमानेऽर्थापत्तिसम्भवाभावानामनर्थान्तरभावाच्चाप्रतिषेध इति भट्टमते वेदान्तिमते चानुपलब्धेरपि प्रमाणान्तरत्वमस्ति तयाचाभाववटो भवतीति तन्मतमपि न मनोरमम अनुपलब्धिस्थले इन्द्रियसम्बद्धविशेषणताप्रत्यासत्त्या प्रत्यक्षमेव भवतीति तत्र चानुपलब्धे कारणत्व न विप्रतिपद्यामहे प्रमाणान्तरत्वन्तु तस्या न युक्तिपदवीं स्पृशतीति सक्षेप ॥

trary to the hypothesis that he should eat by day it follows that he eats at night Similarly the Paurānikas hold probability and traditional teaching to be other forms of evidence Probability is a cognition dependent on a plurality of concomitances as for instance learning is probable in a Brahman and a hundred instances are probable among a thousand while there is no pervasion or universal concomitance necessitated Such is their view In like manner traditional teaching which is delivered in the form Thus indeed they have declared for this is a proposition derived through a succession of witnesses and having no determinate author For instance In every sacred fig tree a Yaksha dwells &c This in the view of the Paurānikas being ascertained as having been declared *by competent authority* is not included under *verbal knowledge*

This doctrine of theirs is not correct for traditional teaching being a kind of verbal knowledge is included under inference Probability also, so far as it involves a pervasion is included under *inference*, and so far as it is irrespective of universal concomitance is not a form of evidence at all Accordingly it is declared in the aphorisms of Gautama Inasmuch as traditional teaching is not a different thing it is not denied of verbal knowledge and inasmuch as disjunctive argumentation probability and impossibility are not different things they are not denied of inference

According to the doctrine of Bhaṭṭa and that of the Vedanta non observation is also another form of evidence and apprehension of non existence takes place thereby This doctrine also cannot be accepted In the case of non observation it is perception that arises by means of a presentation of attribution connected with the organs of sense. We do not controvert the fact that this is the cause of non-observation but to maintain that non observation is an independent form of evidence does not belong to the course of propriety V

आत्ममनसो संयोगविशेषात् संस्काराच्च स्मृति ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Reminiscence results from a particular conjunction of the soul with the internal organ, and from reproduction

[1] The word results is to be supplied The particular conjunction is reflection and other attention From this, as the non coinherent cause reminiscence, a kind of knowledge, is produced in the soul as the co inherent cause The instrumental cause is stated in the words from reproduction and by the particle and the active element of former experience is involved This recollection or reminiscence simulates the correctness or incorrectness of the previous experience, such being the recollection of one who mistakes a rope for a snake and flees from it Reminiscence does not take place always in every case, since it depends on the resuscitation of a mental retention The knowledge of inspired sages is not separately defined by the author of the aphorisms, being included in the perception of ascetics but it is stated in the section intitled Enunciation of the categories, that the presentative cognition which is declared to belong to inspired sages the promulgators of revelation resulting from particular merit, from conjunction of the soul and the internal organ irrespective of inferential marks &c, and *conversant about supersensible objects past present, and to come, about merit &c* and about the *contents of books,* is called the knowledge of inspired sages This belongs also at times to ordinary people as when a young maiden says My heart assures me that my brother will depart tomorrow U

---

[1] उत्पद्यत इतिशेष संयोगविशेष प्रणिधानादिसन्निधानम एतस्मादसमवायिका रणादात्मनि समवायिनि स्मृतिर्विद्याविशेष उत्पद्यते निमित्तकारणमाह संस्कारादिति चकारेण व्यापारो पूर्वानुभव समुच्चीयते अनुभवयाथार्थ्यायाथार्थ्यमियमनुविधत्ते रज्जुभुज ङ्गतयोपलभ्य पलायितस्य तथैव स्मृते नच सतत स्मृतिप्रसङ्ग संस्कारोद्बोधाधीनत्वात आर्षं ज्ञान सूत्रकृता पृथग लक्षितं योगिप्रत्यक्षान्तर्भावित पदार्थप्रदेशाख्ये तु प्रकरणे तदुक्तं तद्यथा आम्नायविधातॄणामृषीणामतीतानागतवर्तमानेष्वतीन्द्रियेषु धर्मादिषु ग्रन्थोपनि बद्धेषु वा लिङ्गाद्यनपेक्षादात्ममनसो संयोगाद्धर्मविशेषाच्च प्रातिभ ज्ञानं यदुत्पद्यते त दार्षम इति तच्च कदाचिल्लौकिकानामपि भवति यथा कन्यका वदति श्वो मे भ्राता गन्तेति हृदय मे कथयतीति ॥

[1] Reminiscence arises from a particular conjunction of the soul and the internal organ, that is, from a conjunction of the soul and the *internal* organ *accompanied with a desire of recollection*, from reproduction in its common form called resuscitation, and from an excitant implied by the particle and. The instrument therein is purpose, not identical with disregard, the operation is reproduction, the excitants are the concomitants (or associated ideas), the non-coinherent cause is conjunction of the soul and the internal organ, and the instrumental cause is reflection &c, consisting *of the desire of recollection* V

तथा स्वप्नः ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 So also dreaming

[2] As reminiscence results from a particular conjunction of the soul and the internal organ so also does cognition *in dreaming* Dreaming consciousness is the intellection of the internal organ, which arises by means of the organs of sense in one whose senses are at rest, and whose internal organ is absorbed *This is of three kinds*. It arises partly from intensity of reproduction whatever

---

[1] आत्ममनसो संयोगविशेषात सुस्मूर्षादिसहितादात्ममनःसंयोगात संस्कारात् समानाकारकात् भावनाख्यात् चकारादुद्बोधकाच्च स्मृतिर्भवति तत्र च उपेक्षानात्मक निश्चय करणं संस्कारो व्यापार उद्बोधकास्तत्र सहकारिण आत्ममनःसंयोगोऽसमवायिकारणं सुस्मूर्षारूपप्रणिधानादिकं निमित्तकारणमित्यर्थः ॥

[2] यथात्ममनसोः संयोगविशेषात संस्काराच्च स्मृतिस्तथा स्वप्नज्ञानमपीत्यर्थः । उपरतेन्द्रियग्रामस्य प्रलीनमनस्कस्य इन्द्रियद्वारेण यदनुभवन मानसम तत स्वप्नज्ञानम तच्च त्रिविध किञ्चित् संस्कारपाटवात कामी क्रुद्धो वा यमर्थमादृतश्चिन्तयन् स्वपिति तस्य तस्यामवस्थायां प्रत्यक्षाकारं ज्ञान पुराणादिश्रवणजनितसंस्कारवशा जायते कर्णार्जुनीयं युद्धमद्येत्याकारम किञ्चिद्धातुना वातपित्तश्लेष्मणा दोषात तत्र वातदोषादाकाशगमनवसुन्धरापर्यटनव्याघ्रादिभयपलायनादीनि पश्यति पित्तदोषदोषमहिम्ना वह्निप्रवेशहिज्वालालिङ्गन कनकपर्वतविद्युल्लताविस्फुरणदिग्दाहादिक पश्यति श्लेष्मदोषात समुद्रसन्तरणनदीमज्जनधारासारवर्षणरजतपर्वतादि पश्यति यत्स्वप्नादपि जन्मानुभूतेषु जन्मान्तरानुभूते वा मिथ्यात्वनाम करणस्य धर्माधर्मसुत्पद्यते तत्र शु भावेदक धर्मात गजारोहणपर्वतारोहणछत्रलाभपायसभक्षणराजसन्दर्शनादिविषयकम धर्मात तैलाभ्यङ्गान्धकूपपतनोष्ट्रारोहणपङ्कमज्जनस्वविवाहादर्शनादिविषयक स्वप्नज्ञानमुत्पद्यते स्वप्नज्ञानस्य सामान्यतस्त्रैविध्यं कारणत्रयेण गुणप्रधानभावेनापि विभागो द्रष्टव्य ॥

object one in love or anger thinks of intently when he goes to sleep, taking with him in that state the form of perceptive cognition through the influence of mental reproductive power produced by previous hearing of the legendaries *(Purânas)* &c, in the form This is the contest between Karna and Arjuna and the like It arises partly from derangement of the bodily affections wind, bile and phlegm Of these, one under disorder of flatulency experiences transit through the air, wandering about on the earth, fleeing with fear from tigers &c, another by the excess of the derangement caused by inordinate secretion of bile experiences entrance into fire, the embracing of flames of fire, and sees golden mountains, the corruscations of flashing lightning, the conflagration of the spheres &c , another through predominance of phlegmatic disorder experiences passages through the sea, immersions in rivers and sprinklings with showers of rain, and sees mountains of silver and the like Through the influence of merits also, in the cognition which is produced in the internal organ immersed in the experiences of this or former states of being arises auspicious imagination, due to merit, and having as its objects the riding upon elephants ascent of mountains, assumption of the princely umbrella, feasting upon rice and milk, interviews with the sovereign, and the like, while through demerit arises dreaming imagination of unction with oil, the falling through blindness into a well, riding upon camels, immersion in mire, the sight of one's own nuptials and the like. Herein the three are conjointly causes and this division is to be considered as reposing on the relation of predominance among the qualities U

स्वप्नान्तिकम् ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 [So also] consciousness in dreaming

[1] Some one may say The cognition which arises during a dream, in the form of recollection of that which is experienc-

[1] ननु यज्ज्ञानं स्वप्नमध्ये स्वप्नज्ञानानुभूतस्यैवार्थस्य स्मृतिरूपं जायते तत्र स्वप्नत्वं न वर्तते स्वप्नस्यानुभवरूपत्वात् तथाच कस्मात् कारणात्तदुत्पत्तिरित्यत आह । तथेति

ed in dreaming cognition has not the nature of dreaming inasmuch as it is an experience of dreaming whence then does it arise? The answer is furnished in the aphorism The words *So also* are to be taken in from the preceding aphorism The meaning therefore is that as dreaming so also the consciousness in dreaming arises from a particular conjunction of the soul with the internal organ and from reproduction The difference extends thus far that cognition in dreaming results from reproduction produced by former experience while consciousness in dreaming results from reproduction produced by experience arising at the very time It has therefore been stated by Praśasta devâchârya that *from looking back upon past cognitions recollection only results*, and the author of the Vṛtti says that *cognition in dreaming being a flash of experienced object is not a different thing from reminiscence* Some teach that consciousness in dreaming is knowledge amounting to certitude during dreams such as that one is lying in bed U

धर्माच्च ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 Also from merit

[1] A cause of dreams and of consciousness in dreaming is added The particle *also* implies the addition of demerit The explanation of this has already been given

इन्द्रियदोषात् संस्कारदोषाच्चाविद्या ॥ १० ॥

Aph 10 *Nescience results from derangement of the organs of sense and from imperfection in reproduction*

पूर्वसूत्रादनुवर्त्तते तथात्ममनसोः संयोगविशेषात् संस्काराच्च यथा स्वप्नस्तथा स्वप्नान्तिकमप्युत्पद्यते। एतावानेव विशेषो यत् स्वप्नज्ञानं पूर्वानुभवजनितात् संस्कारात् स्वप्नान्तिकन्तु संस्कारात्तदानीन्तनानुभवजनितसंस्कारादेव तदुक्तं प्रशस्तदेवाचार्यैः अतीतज्ञानप्रत्यवेक्षणात् स्मृतिरेव इति। उक्तञ्च वृत्तिकारैः अनुभूतस्य स्फुरणतया न स्मरणादर्थान्तरं स्वप्नज्ञानम् इति। स्वप्नमध्ये प्रमाभूतं यज्ज्ञानं तत् स्वप्नान्तिकमिति केचित् यथा शय्यायां शयानोऽस्मीत्यादि॥

[1] स्वप्नस्वप्नान्तिकयोः कारणं समुच्चिनोति। अधर्मसमुच्चयार्थश्चकारः कृतव्याख्यानमेतत्।

[1] Intelligence according to another mode is divided into two kinds, certitude and incertitude. Of these, the cause of incertitude is stated. Derangements of the organs of sense are ophthalmia &c. Imperfection in reproduction is the resulting from erroneous experience. The particle *and* implies the addition of such imperfections as remoteness &c, and assumptions of which the inferential mark is illegitimate. The cause then of nescience or incertitude is *imperfection*, and imperfection, as consisting of biliousness, remoteness &c, is of various kinds. V

तद्दुष्टज्ञानम् ॥ ११ ॥

Aph. 11. This is imperfect cognition.

[2] *This, an uninflected word, employed pronominally refers to* nescience. This nescience is defective cognition, cognition unduly extended or restricted, cognition determined by a form of which it is not susceptible and asserting that this is in that, a cognition the determination of which does not reside in the thing to be determined. Imperfection is defined as being uncertainty of cognition. Suspense, therefore, though admitting of one valid alternative, is vicious, being identical with inattention. The four forms of nescience, therefore known as suspense, erroneous assurance, dreaming, and non-apprehension are hereby implied. U

अदुष्टं विद्या ॥ १२ ॥

Aph. 12. Free from imperfection it is science.

---

[1] प्रकारान्तरेणापि बुद्धिर्द्विविधा प्रमाऽप्रमा चेति तत्राप्रमायाः कारणमाह । इन्द्रियदोषः काचादिः संस्कारदोषो भ्रमानुभवजातत्वादि चकाराद्दूरत्वादिरूपाणामसल्लिङ्गपरामर्शादिरूपाणाञ्च दोषाणां संग्रहः तथा चाविद्यायामप्रमायां दोषः कारणं दोषस्तु पित्तदूरत्वादिरूपो नानाविध इत्यर्थः ॥

[2] तदित्यव्ययपदं सर्वनामसमानार्थकमविद्यां परामृशति साऽविद्या दुष्टज्ञानं व्यभिचारिज्ञानमेतस्मिंस्तदिति ज्ञानं व्यधिकरणप्रकारावच्छिन्नं विशेष्यावृत्तिप्रकारकमिति यावत् दोषश्च ज्ञानस्यानिश्चयरूपत्वमपि तेनैकत्रैककोटिकत्वेऽपि संशयो दुष्टः स्यादनवधारणात्मकत्वात् तदनेन संशयविपर्ययस्वप्नानध्यवसायानां चतुर्णामप्युपग्रहः ॥

[1] The word cognition is to be supplied from the preceding aphorism. Science is experience of that whereof there is cognition free from imperfection, that is produced by organs of sense which are not deranged, recognition of a character in its proper subject, or experience the form of which resides in a common substratum, or experience such that that which is not its form does not reside in its subject, and this is of two kinds intuitive and inferential. U

आर्षं सिद्धदर्शनञ्च धर्मेभ्यः ॥ १३ ॥

Aph 13 The knowledge of inspired sages, and perfect vision result from merits

[2] Some might ask wherefore the knowledge of ascetics is not nescience since imperfection of the objects, as remoteness &c is possible in such cognition To this the answer is furnished in the aphorism The knowledge of inspired sages which is produced by merit acquired by asceticism the perfect vision, the vision of all objects perfect or real arises from merits. If it be suggested that demerit may be the cause thereof we deny this for such knowledge is never erroneous and demerit is the cause of error But the knowledge of ascetics depending solely upon merit arises solely in the form of certitude inasmuch as remoteness and the like the defects of the object cannot effect erroneousness therein, and we

[1] ज्ञानमित्यनुवर्तते अदुष्टमदुष्टेन्द्रियजन्यं यत्र यदस्ति तत्र तदनुभवो वा समानाधिकरणप्रकारानुभवो वा विशेष्यावृत्त्यप्रकारकानुभवो वा विद्येत्यर्थः तच्चाध्यक्षलैङ्गिकरूपं द्वयमेव ॥

[2] ननु योगिनां ज्ञानं कथमविद्या न भवति दूरत्वादिरूपविषयदोषस्य तत्रापि सम्भवादत आह । आर्षमृषीणां योगजधर्मेण जनितं यत् सिद्धदर्शनं सिद्धानां मतां सर्वेषां वस्तूनां दर्शनं तद्धर्मेभ्यो जायते नतु तत्राधर्मः कारणमिति न तत् कदाचिदपि भ्रमरूपं भ्रमं प्रति अधर्मस्य हेतुत्वात् योगिनां ज्ञानन्तु धर्ममात्राधीनं प्रमारूपमेव भवति दूरत्वादिविषयदोषस्य तत्र भ्रमत्वाप्रयोजकत्वात् दोषाणां भ्रमजनकत्वं धर्मप्रतिबन्धकत्वेनैव केषाञ्चित्तु सिद्धेन मन्त्राद्यभिमन्त्रितगुटिकाञ्जनविशेषादिना यद्दर्शनं भवति तदपि आर्षवत् धर्मजन्यमेव भवति अतएव रघुर्गो अतीन्द्रियेष्वप्युपपन्नदर्शनो बभूव भावेषु हितोपपन्नम् इत्यादिकमपि सङ्गच्छते तथाच तादृशज्ञानमपि धर्ममात्राधीनतया प्रमारूपमेव भवतीति भाव इति व्याचक्षते ॥

feel assured that defects beget error only by the assistance of demerit Some maintain that the vision which results by means of a spell, as by means of a particular kind of ball of collyrium over which a sacred text has been recited results only from merits like the knowledge of *inspired sages* *The verse of the Raghu vanśa* [ch 3 41] The son of Dilipa acquired the vision of supersensible objects &c , well accords with this exposition Hence they explain the meaning to be that such knowledge also is depending only upon merit arises solely in the form of certitude V

TENTH BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

दृष्टानिष्टकारणविशेषाद्विरोधाच्च मिथ. सुखदु खयोरर्थान्तरभावः ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Inasmuch as causes desirable and undesirable are different and opposed the relation of pleasure and pain is that of reciprocally different objects

¹ The object of the tenth book is the exposition of the division of the attributes of the soul according to their cause. "The division of pleasure and pain is first stated among these with the purpose of rejecting the error that pleasure differs not from pain which error might arise from the omission of pleasure in the apho-"

¹ आत्मगुणाना कारणतो भेदव्युत्पादन दशमाध्यायार्थ तत्र आत्मशरीरेन्द्रियार्थबुद्धिमन प्रवृत्तिदोष प्रेत्यभावफलदु खापवर्गास्तु प्रमेयम इति गौतमीये प्रमेयविभागसूत्रे सुखस्यानभिधानात् दु खाभिन्नमेव सुखमिति भ्रमनिरासाय सुखदु खयोरेव प्रथम भेदमाह । सुखदु खयोर्मिथ परस्परमर्थान्तरभावो भेदो वैजात्यमितियावत् कुत इत्यत आह इष्टानिष्टकारणविशेषात इष्ट इष्यमाण स्रक्चन्दनवनितादि अनिष्टमनिष्यमाण अहिकण्टकादि तद्रूप यत्कारण तस्य विशेषाद्भेदात कारणवैजात्याधीन कार्यवैजात्य आवश्यक यत भेदकान्तरमाह विरोधात सहानवस्थानलक्षणात् नह्येकस्मिन्नात्मन्येकदा सुखदु खयोरनुभव । चकारादनयो कार्यभेद भेदक समुच्चिनोति तथाहि अनुग्रहाभिष्वङ्गनयनप्रसादादिमुखस्य दैन्यमुखमालिन्यादिदु खस्य कार्यमिति ततो ऽप्यनयोर्भेद । तदुक्त प्रशस्ताचार्ये अनुग्रहलक्षण सुख स्रगाद्यभिप्रेतविषयसान्निध्ये सति इष्टोपलब्धीन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षाद्धर्माद्यपेक्षादात्ममनसो संयोगाद्यदनुग्रहाभिष्वङ्गनयनादिप्रसादजनकमुत्पद्यते तत् सुखम इति तदिदमतीतेषु स्रक्चन्दनादिषु स्मृतिजमनागतेषु सङ्कल्पजम गौतमीये सूत्रे सुखापरिगणन वैराग्याय सुखमपि दु खत्वेन भावयता वैराग्य स्यादेतदर्थमिति ॥

rism of Gautama which enumerates the objects of certitude Soul body organ of sense object of sense intelligence internal organ activity fault transmigration recompense pain and emancipation are the objects of certitude There exists between pleasure and pain the mutual relation of different objects difference or variety Should it be asked why it is so it is stated that it is because there is a difference in causes desirable and undesirable that is, because there is a distinction between a desirable cause such as garlands sandal-wood women &c and an undesirable cause such as snakes thorns &c Difference of effect necessarily depends upon difference of cause Another ground of the distinction in laid down in the opposition for pleasure and pain are never experienced simultaneously in one and the same soul By the particle *and* the difference of the effects of pleasure and pain is implied also as a ground for distinguishing between them For instance, complaisance the embrace clearness of the eyes &c are the effects of pleasure while despondency and a sullied countenance are the effects of pain wherefore pleasure and pain must differ It has therefore been stated by Prasasta devácharya Pleasure has complaisance as its characteristic, and is that which is produced through conjunction of the soul and internal organ supposing merit &c or through the contiguity of the organ and the object of sense in the recognition of something desirable produced where garlands and other desirable objects are at hand and is productive of complaisance embraces clearness of the eyes &c In the case of past objects such as garlands sandal wood and the like pleasure arises from reminiscence in the case of future objects from purpose or resolution The non enumeration of pleasure in the aphorism of Gautama is to promote indifference since indifference would arise in one who should account even pleasure as pain U

संशयनिर्णयान्तरभावश्च ज्ञानान्तरत्वे हेतु ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Non inclusion in doubt and assurance is a mark that [pleasure and pain] are different from cognition

feel assured that defects beget error only by the assistance of demerit. Some maintain that the vision which results by means of a spell, as by means of a particular kind of ball of collyrium over which a sacred text has been recited, results only from merits, like the knowledge of inspired sages The verse of the Raghu vanśa, [ch 3 41] The son of Dilipa acquired the vision of supersensible objects &c, *well accords with this exposition* *Hence they explain* the meaning to be that such knowledge also, as depending only upon merit, arises solely in the form of certitude V

TENTH BOOK, FIRST DAILY LESSON

इष्टानिष्टकारणविशेषाद्विरोधाच्च मिथः सुखदुःखयोरर्थान्तरभावः ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 Inasmuch as causes desirable and undesirable are different and opposed the relation of pleasure and pain is that of reciprocally different objects

[1] The object of the tenth book is the exposition of the division of the attributes of the soul according to their cause "The division of pleasure and pain is first stated among these, with the *purpose of rejecting the error that pleasure differs not from pain,* which error might arise from the omission of pleasure in the apho-*

---

[1] आत्मगुणानां कारणतो भेदव्युत्पादनं दशमाध्यायार्थः तत्र आत्मशरीरेन्द्रियार्थबुद्धिमनःप्रवृत्तिदोषप्रेत्यभावफलदुःखापवर्गास्तु प्रमेयम् इति गौतमीये प्रमेयविभागसूत्रे सुखस्यानभिधानात् दुःखाभिन्नमेव सुखमिति भ्रमनिरासार्थं सुखदुःखयोरेव प्रथमं भेदमाह । सुखदुःखयोर्मिथः परस्परमर्थान्तरभावो भेदो वैजात्यमिति यावत् कुत इत्यत आह इष्टानिष्टकारणविशेषात् इष्टं इष्यमाणं स्रक्चन्दनवनितादि अनिष्टमनिष्यमाणमहिकण्टकादि तद्रूपं यत्कारणं तस्य विशेषाद्भेदात् कारणवैजात्याधीनं कार्यवैजात्यमावश्यकं यतः भेदकान्तरमाह विरोधात् सहानवस्थानलक्षणात् नह्येकस्मिन्नात्मन्येकदा सुखदुःखयोरनुभवः । चकारादनयोः कार्यभेदं भेदकं समुच्चिनोति तथाहि अनुग्रहाभिष्वङ्गनयनप्रसादादि सुखस्य दैन्यमुखमालिन्यादि दुःखस्य कार्यमिति ततोऽप्यनयोर्भेदः । तदुक्तं प्रशस्ताचार्यैः अनुग्रहलक्षणं सुखं स्रगाद्यभिप्रेतविषयसान्निध्ये सति इष्टोपलब्धीन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षाद्धर्माद्यपेक्षादात्ममनसोः संयोगादनुग्रहाभिष्वङ्गनयनादिप्रसादजनकमुत्पद्यते तत् सुखम् इति तदिदमतीतेषु स्रक्चन्दनादिषु स्मृतिजमनागतेषु सङ्कल्पजम् गौतमीये सूत्रे सुखापरिगणनं वैराग्यार्थं सुखमपि दुःखत्वेन भावयतो वैराग्यं स्यादिति तदर्थमिति ॥

ism of Gautama which enumerates the objects of certitude Soul, body, organ of sense, object of sense intelligence, internal organ, activity, fault transmigration, recompense pain, and *emancipation* are the objects of certitude There exists between pleasure and pain the mutual relation of different objects difference or variety Should it be asked why it is so, it is stated that it is because there is a difference in causes desirable and undesirable, that is, because there is a distinction between a desirable cause such as garlands sandal-wood, women &c, and an undesirable cause such as snakes, thorns &c Difference of effect necessarily depends upon difference of cause Another ground of the distinction in laid down in the opposition for pleasure and pain are never experienced simultaneously in one and the same soul By the particle *and* the difference of the effects of pleasure and pain is implied also as a ground for distinguishing between them For instance complaisance the embrace, clearness of the eyes &c are the effects of pleasure while despondency and a sullied countenance are the effects of pain wherefore pleasure and pain must differ It has therefore been stated by Prasasta-devacharya Pleasure has complaisance as its characteristic, and is that which is produced through conjunction of the soul and internal organ supposing merit &c or through the contiguity of the organ and the object of sense in the recognition of something desirable produced where garlands and other desirable objects are at hand, and is productive of complaisance embraces, clearness of the eyes &c In the case of past objects such as garlands, sandal wood *and the like* pleasure arises from reminiscence, in the case of future objects from purpose or resolution The non enumeration of pleasure in the aphorism of Gautama is to promote indifference, since indifference would arise in one who should account even pleasure as pain U

संशयनिर्णयान्तरभावश्च ज्ञानान्तरत्वे हेतुः ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Non inclusion in doubt and assurance is a mark that [pleasure and pain] are different from cognition

[1] The mark that pleasure and pain are different from cognition, distinct from the attribute knowledge, is that they are not included under doubt and assurance that is, that they do not fall under *either certainty or uncertainty* For *the attribute knowledge is* of two kinds doubt and assurance, and neither pleasure nor pain can be included under either of those kinds For neither pleasure nor pain has the *form of two repugnant alternatives that it should* be probable that they have the nature of doubt nor has either possession of a given form together with absence of the negation of that form that it should be likely that they have the nature of assurance or certainty The supposition of a third form of cognition is chimerical and consequently neither pleasure nor pain can come under knowledge V

तयोर्निष्पत्तिः प्रत्यक्षलैङ्गिकाभ्याम् ॥ ३ ॥

Aph 3 The production thereof [i e of doubt and assurance] is by means of perception and inference

[2] The production thereof that is of doubt and assurance results from perception, and from an inferential mark Neither plea-

---

[1] सुखदुःखयोर्ज्ञानान्तरत्वे ज्ञानगुणभिन्नत्वे संशयनिर्णयान्तराभावः संशयनिश्चयान्तर्गतत्वाभावो हेतुः । ज्ञानगुणो हि द्विविधः सन्देहो निश्चयश्चेति नहि तयोरन्यतरस्मिन्नपि सुखं दुःखं वाऽन्तर्भवितुमर्हति नहि सुखं दुःखं वा विरुद्धकोटिद्वयप्रकारकं येन तयोः सन्देहत्वं सम्भाव्येत नापि तदभावाप्रकारकं सत्तत्प्रकारकं येन निर्णयत्वं सम्भाव्येतेति ज्ञानस्य तृतीयप्रकारस्तु अप्रामाणिक इति नातस्तत्र सुखं दुःखं वा प्रवेष्टुमीष्टे इति ॥

[2] तयोः संशयनिर्णययोर्निष्पत्तिरुत्पत्तिः प्रत्यक्षाल्लिङ्गाच्च सुखदुःखे वा न प्रत्यक्षसामग्रीजन्ये न वा लिङ्गजन्ये चतुर्विधं हि सुखं वैषयिकं मानोरथिकम् आभिमानिकम् आभ्यासिकञ्च तत्र चक्षुरादीन्द्रियसन्निकर्षप्रभवत्वं नास्त्येव प्रथममिन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षजत्वात् ज्ञानं स्यादिति चेन्न संसर्गैकदेशस्य कार्यस्य साक्षात्त्वानापादकत्वात् अन्यथा दिक्कालसाधारण्येन सकलकार्यैकत्वापत्तेः किञ्च इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षोत्पद्यमानं सुखं निर्विकल्पकं वा स्यात् सविकल्पकं वा नाद्यः अतीन्द्रियत्वप्रसङ्गात् न द्वितीयः विशेष्यविशेषणभावेन द्वयोरनालम्बनत्वात् किञ्च सुखदुःखयोरात्मप्रत्यक्षसंवेद्यत्वात् ज्ञानस्य स्वप्रत्यक्षसंवेद्यत्वेऽनवस्थाप्रसङ्गात् लैङ्गिकमिति लिङ्गमेव वैषयिकम् । वृत्तिकृतस्तु तयोर्ज्ञानसुखयोर्निष्पत्तिः प्रत्यक्षलैङ्गिकाभ्यां प्रत्यक्षलैङ्गिकज्ञानाभ्यां व्याख्याता प्रत्यक्षं ज्ञानमिन्द्रियजम् लैङ्गिकन्तु लिङ्गजम् सुखादिकन्तु नैतादृशमिति व्याचख्युः ॥

sure nor pain is produced by the presentative or inferential apparatus For pleasure is of four kinds, sensuous accompanying desire, relating to self esteem, or resulting from consuetude. *Of the* last three of these origination from juxtaposition of the object to *the organ of sense cannot be predicated And should it be contended* that the first is cognition inasmuch as it is generated by *contiguity of the organ and object of sense, we reply that it is not* so, for part only of the causal apparatus cannot prove homogeneity in the product, else all products would be uniform as having time and space as their common antecedents Moreover, if pleasure were cognition the pleasure which is not produced through contiguity of the organ and object of sense, would be either non-discriminative or discriminative, but it cannot be the former, for then it would be *supersensible nor can it be the latter,* inasmuch as it does not consist of a judgment respecting two objects in the relation of subject and predicate. Again as pleasure and pain are necessarily accompanied with sensibility were they forms of cognition there would be involved in the notion of a sensibility of cognition *a regression to infinity The inferential means an argument* as the objective means an object. The author of the Vritti explains the aphorism thus that the origin of these that is of cognition and pleasure is explained by perception and inference that is by perceptive and inferential cognition, and that whereas perceptive cognition is produced by the senses, and inferential by arguments it is otherwise with pleasure, &c U

अभूदित्यपि ॥ ४ ॥

Aph 4 *The notion of the past also* [is a difference between cognition and pleasure and pain]

[1] A difference depending upon a difference of form in pleasure

---

[1] ऐन्द्रियकज्ञानात्सुखादेः प्रकारभेदाधीनं भेदमाह । इतिशब्दः प्रकारे अपिशब्दो भविष्यत्त्वोत्पादकारणसमुच्चये तथा पर्य्यंसे च स्मृत्यनुभवः स्मृति र्यति ऐन्द्रिके ज्ञाने सादि प्रकारो दृश्यते भवेषप्रकारे सुख व्यापिता उत्पद्यमानमनुभवत्यन्त ॥

&c, as compared with inferential knowlege is here stated The word *iti* means *the form*, and *the word also adds another form*, that of the future A form, therefore, past &c, is observed in inferential knowledge, as that fire has been or will be in the mountain, but pleasure or pain produced under this form has never been observed U

सति च कार्यादर्शनात् ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Also [pleasure and pain are not forms of cognition] inasmuch as the effect is not [always] observed, where [the antecedents] are

[1] *Another difference is added* Pleasure and pain are not merely perception or merely inference, since the effect, pleasure or pain, is not always observed where the antecedent, *contiguity* of organ and object of sense, or attention to the universal concomitance and the attribution respecting the subject of the question, exists The meaning, therefore, is as follows Pleasure and pain are not cognition in general, while particular cognition is either perceptive knowledge, or knowledge, in the form of inference Pleasure and pain are not the former, inasmuch as there is sometimes no experience of the pleasurable, where there is contiguity of the object and organ of sense as where there is perception of garlands, sandal-wood &c, nor are they the latter since there is sometimes *no experience of either the pleasurable or the painful, where* there exists an inference respecting sandal wood &c or an inference, respecting fire &c. Since, therefore pleasure and pain are not always *experienced in the particular perception or in the particular inference*, they are not those particular perceptions and inferences U.

---

[1] भेदकान्तरं समुच्चिनोति । सति इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षे सति च न प्रत्यक्षपक्षधर्मतादिप्रतिसन्धाने कार्यस्य सुखस्य दुःखस्य वाऽदर्शनात् न प्रत्यक्षमात्रं सुखं दुःखं वा न लैङ्गिकमात्रं वा तदयमर्थः ज्ञानसामान्यं तावत् सुखदुःखे न भवत इत्युक्तं ज्ञानविशेष प्रत्यक्षात्मा वा भवेदनुमितिरूपो वा इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षे स्रक्चन्दनादिप्रत्यक्षे सुखत्वानुभवाभावात् न द्वितीयः चन्दनाद्यनुमितौ वह्न्याद्यनुमितौ वा सुखदुःखत्वान्यतराननुभवात् एवं प्रत्यक्षविशेषेऽनुमितिविशेषे वा सुखदुःखयोरननुभवाच्च तद्विशेषोऽपीति ॥

cognition inasmuch as they are derived from a peculiar cause of its own kind having its own common substratum as is the case with reminiscence, with the first sound in a series of sounds and the like U

एकदेशे इत्येकस्मिन् शिरः पृष्ठमुदरं मर्माणि तद्विशेषस्तद्विशेषेभ्यः ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 *The head the back, the stomach and the vitals are in one part in one [body] their difference results from the difference thereof [that is from the difference of their causes]*

[1] It may be urged that if the difference between pleasure and pain *and cognition depend on a difference in the causes and if the difference between pleasure and pain be like that between a post* and a water pot and the like there can be no mutual difference between the body and its parts as the head feet back, stomach &c there being in regard to these no difference in the ultimate particles binary atomic aggregates &c or the causes of blood and semen Accordingly the statement of the aphorism In one part means in one constituent portion, in one in one body The head is one part the stomach the back and the vitals imply the muscles &c. The difference of these that is their heterogeneity, results from the difference thereof that is from the difference of their causes *For the co-inherent cause of the stomach the back* &c, is not of the same kind as that of the head, just as the heterogeneity of a piece of cloth a water pot &c results from hete-

[1] ननु यदि कारणभेदाधीनो ज्ञानात सुखदुःखयोः सुखाच्च दुःखस्य स्तम्भकुम्भादिवदेव परस्परं भेदः तदा शरीरस्य तदवयवानाञ्च शिरःपादपृष्ठोदरादीनां न परस्परं भेदः स्यात तत्र हि परमाणुद्व्यणुकादीनां लोहितरेतसोर्बीजकारणानामविशेषादित्यत आह । एकदेशइति अवयवे इत्यर्थः एकस्मिन्निति शरीरे इत्यर्थः शिर इत्येकदेशः उदरं पृष्ठं मर्माणि च स्नायुप्रभृतीनि तेषां विशेषो वैजात्यम् तद्विशेषेभ्यस्तत्कारणविशेषेभ्यः तत्रापि कारणवैजात्यादेव वैजात्यं नहि तज्जातीयं शिरःसमवायिकारणं तज्जातीयमेवोदरपृष्ठादेरपि तन्तुकपालाद्युपादानवैजात्यात पटघटादौ वैजात्यवत तत्रापि वैजात्यसम्भवात् तन्तुकपालादेरपि अंशुशर्करादिवैजात्यात् एवं तत्र तत्राप्यपर्यवसाने परमाणूनां साधारण्येऽपि स्वस्वोपादानवैजात्यस्य सर्वत्र वैजात्यप्रयोजकत्वात् द्रव्यत्वेन तूपादानसाजात्यं न वैजात्यप्रयोजकमित्यादिकं ॥

rogeneity in the threads, the half jars &c, which are their co inherent causes, the heterogeneity of which threads, half jars, &c., results again from heterogeneity in the fibres, lime &c, of which they are composed Heterogeneity is thus to be sought in the successive material causes, for while the atoms may be common, the heterogeneity of the respective material causes invariably gives rise to heterogeneity in the material effects, but homogeneity in respect of substance in the material causes does not cause such heterogeneity U

SECOND DAILY LESSON

कारणमिति द्रव्ये कार्यसमवायात् ॥ १ ॥

Aph 1 The position, with regard to a substance, that it is a cause results from the co inherence of its effects

[1] The discrimination of the three kinds of cause is here collaterally instituted The cognition and expression, as applicable to a substance, that it is a cause, that is, that it is a co-inherent cause,—whence, it may be asked are these derived? It is therefore stated that they are derived from the co inhesion of the effect, inasmuch as there *co-inhere therein substances, qualities and actions U*

संयोगाद्वा ॥ २ ॥

Aph 2 Or from conjunction

[2] It might be asked whether only co inherent causality pertains to substances The reply is furnished in the aphorism. As

---

[1] इदानीं प्रसङ्गतस्त्रयाणां कारणानां विशेषविवेचनमारभते । कारणं समवायिकारणमिदमिति प्रतीतिप्रयोगौ द्रव्ये दृष्टौ कुत एवमत आह कार्यसमवायात् कार्याणि द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि तत्रैव समवयन्ति यत ॥

[2] तत् किं समवायिकारणत्वमात्रं द्रव्याणामत आह । पटोत्पत्तौ तन्तूनां समवायिकारणत्ववत् निमित्तकारणत्वमपि तुरीतन्तुसंयोगस्यापि पटकारणत्वात् तत्संयोगद्वारा तुर्यास्तन्तोश्च पटनिमित्तकारणत्वमपि चाकार समुच्चये तुरीतन्तुसंयोगं प्रति तन्तोः समवायिकारणस्यापि पटं प्रति तद्द्वारा निमित्तकारणत्वात् ॥

co inherent causality, so also operative causality, belongs to the threads in the production of a piece of cloth Inasmuch as conjunction of the shuttle and the thread is also a cause of the cloth the shuttle and the thread are mediately through the conjunction operatively causative of the piece of cloth The particle *or* is used conjunctively Through the thread i e the co inherent cause of the conjunction of the shuttle and the thread it is an operative cause of the piece of cloth *mediately through such conjunction* U

कारणे समवायात् कर्माणि ॥ ३ ॥

Aph. 3 Through co inherence in the cause actions [are non coinherent causes]

[1] It is explained that causality resides in action The words Are non coinherent causes are to be supplied Non coinherent causality is causality co inherent in one object connected with the relation of cause and effect Such causality results either from co inherence in the same object with the effect, or from co inherence in the same object with the cause Of these the former is called in the terminology of the Vaiśeshikas the lesser the latter the greater If it be asked how the non coinherent causality of action in regard to conjunction disjunction and reproduction is recognised, it is here replied that it is through co inherence in the cause that is through co-inherence in the co inherent cause of conjunction &c Non coinherent causality therefore resides in action with respect to conjunction &c by the lesser relation characterised as co inherence in the same object with the effect U

तथा रूपे कारणैकार्थसमवायाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

[1] कर्मणि यादृशकारणत्वं तदाह । असमवायिकारणानीतिशेषः असमवायिकारणत्वञ्च कार्यकारणभावसम्बन्ध्येकार्थसमवेतकारणत्वं तच्च कार्यैकार्थसमवायात् कारणैकार्थसमवायाद्वा तत्राद्या लघ्वी द्वितीया महतीति वैशेषिकपरिभाषा तत्र कया प्रत्यासत्त्या संयोगविभागसंस्कारान् प्रति कर्मणामसमवायिकारणत्वमित्यत आह । कारणे समवायात् कारणे संयोगादिसमवायिकारणे समवायात् तथाच कार्यैकार्थसमवायलक्षणया लघ्व्या प्रत्यासत्त्या संयोगादौ कर्मणामसमवायिकारणत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

Aph 4 Also likewise through co inherence in the same object with the cause in regard to colour

[1] This aphorism is stated in anticipation of the questions as to what causality pertains to colour and other qualities residing in the parts in relation to the qualities &c of the wholes By the words *In regard to to colour*, taste smell, touch number, extent, separateness gravity, fluidity, viscidity and the like are also indicated The word *likewise* extends the application of non coinherent causality Colour and the rest in the whole commence by the greater relation by co inherence in one object together with that whole which is the co inherent cause of the colour &c of the whole, as for instance the colour &c of the half jar originates the colour &c in the jar and similarly in all other cases The word *also* adds to these occasionally operative causality U

कारणसमवायात् संयोगः पटस्य ॥ ५ ॥

Aph 5 Conjunction through co inherence in the cause [is the non-coinherent cause] of a piece of cloth

[2] It is stated that the lesser relation belongs to conjunction which is the non coinherent cause in the origination of a substance Conjunction through co inherence in the cause that is in the co inherent cause is the non coinherent cause of the effect or product by the relation characterised as co inherence in a same object with the effect By the term piece of cloth product substance

[1] रूपादीनां गुणानामवयववर्त्तिनामवयविगुणादिषु कीदृशी कारणतेत्यपेक्षायामाह। रूप इति रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शसङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्त्वगुरुत्वद्रवत्वस्नेहाद्युपलक्षयति तथेत्यसमवायिकारणत्वमतिदिशति कारणैकार्थसमवायादिति अवयविरूपादीनां समवायिकारणं घटस्तत्रापि तेन सहैकार्थसमवायेन महत्या प्रत्यासत्त्याऽवयविरूपादिकमारभते तद्यथा कपालरूपादि घटे रूपादिकमारभते इति सर्वत्र द्रष्टव्यम् चकारादसमवायि क्वाचित्कनिमित्तत्वमपि समुच्चिनोति ॥

[2] द्रव्यारम्भे संयोगस्यासमवायिकारणस्य लघ्वीं प्रत्यासत्तिमाह। कारणे समवायिकारणे समवायात् संयोगोऽपि पटादौ कार्ये कार्यैकार्थसमवायलक्षणया प्रत्यासत्त्याऽसमवायिकारणमित्यर्थः पटपटेन कार्यद्रव्यमात्रमुपलक्षयति यदि त्ववयवावयविसंयोगोऽपि पटादेरसमवायिकारणं तदा कारणैकार्थसमवायोऽपीति कश्चित् ॥

generally is indicated A certain author maintains that if conjunction of part with part be a non coinherent cause of the cloth &c, then co inherence in the same object with the cause is also a non coinherent cause U

कारणकारणसमवायाच्च ॥ ६ ॥

Aph 6 Also through co-inherence with the cause of the cause

[1] *It is stated that causality by the greater relation sometimes pertains to conjunction The conjunction technically termed coalition and residing in the constituent portions of a ball of cotton,* originates magnitude in the ball of cotton, and there is therein the relation of co inherence in the same object as the cause U

संयुक्तसमवायादग्नेर्वैशेषिकम् ॥ ७ ॥

Aph 7 *The differentiating character of fire [is an operative* or efficient cause] through co inherence with the conjunct

[2] Operative causality is described The differentiating character of fire that is heat which is its peculiar attribute is through co inherence with the conjunct the efficient cause of colour &c produced by baking Hot touch then is the operative cause of qualities produced by baking by the relation of conjunction with its own substratum The general definition of an efficient cause is to be understood to be a cause other than the co inherent and non coinherent causes V

दृष्टानां दृष्टप्रयोजनानां दृष्टाभावे प्रयोगोऽभ्युदयाय ॥ ८ ॥

Aph 8 The employment of visible observances the uses

[1] संयोगस्य क्वचित् महत्त्वा प्रत्यासत्त्या कारणत्वमित्याह । तूलपिण्डावयवेषु वर्तमानं प्रचयाख्यं संयोगस्तूलकपिण्डे महत्त्वमारभते तत्र कारणैकार्थसमवाय प्रत्यासत्तिरित्यर्थः ॥

[2] निमित्तकारणतां निरूपयति । अग्नेर्वैशेषिकं विशेषगुणात्मकमौष्ण्यं संयुक्तसमवायात् पाकजरूपादौ निमित्तकारणम् तथाच पाकजं प्रति स्वाश्रयसंयोगसम्बन्धेन उष्णस्पर्शो निमित्तकारणम् समवायिकारणासमवायिकारणभिन्नं कारणं निमित्तकारणमिति सामान्यलक्षणं बोध्यम् ॥

whereof are visible in the absence of visible results tends to exaltation

[1] The employment, or performance of observances such as sacrifice almsgiving, penance &c. which are visible that is which are duly celebrated and the uses whereof are visible that is the utility of which is known by imperative precepts in the absence *of visible results of these respective observances where such results* are impossible in consequence of absence of desire for such and such consequences tends to exaltation that is to a resultant desire of knowledge induced by purity of intellect Observances therefore whose utility is determined as elysian bliss &c enjoined by such precepts as Let him who desires paradise offer the sacrifice of horses when performed disinterestedly do not produce elysian bliss &c as their fruit but produce as their result purity of intellect and the like according to the Vedic text They desire knowledge and the traditional text When wordly attachment has by observances born its fruits knowledge is afterwards produced V

तद्वचनादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यमिति ॥ ९ ॥

Aph 9 [It has been stated that] authoritativeness pertains *to revelation because declared by Him*

[2] The word *iti* indicates the *conclusion* of the system Authoritativeness pertains to revelation that is to the Veda because

---

[1] दृष्टाना विधिदृष्टाना दृष्टप्रयोजनाना दृष्ट विध्यर्थवादादिना ज्ञात प्रयोजन येषा तथाविधाना कर्मणा यज्ञदानतप प्रभृतीना प्रयोगोऽनुष्ठान दृष्टाना तत्तत्कर्मफलानामभावे तत्तत फलकामनाविरहादसम्भवे अभ्युदयाय चित्तशुद्धिप्रयुक्तविविदिषात्मक फलाय भवति तथाच स्वर्गकामोऽश्वमेधेन यजेत इत्यादिविधिविहिताना स्वर्गाद्यात्मकप्रतिनियतप्रयोजनाना कर्मणा निष्कामेण कृताना न स्वर्गादिफलजनकत्व किन्तु चित्तशुद्ध्याद्यात्मकफलजनकत्वमेव विविदिषन्ति इत्यादिश्रुते कषाये कर्मभि पक्वे ततो ज्ञान प्रजायत इत्यादिस्मृतश्चेति भाव ॥

[2] इति शास्त्रपरिसमाप्तौ तद्वचनात्तमेश्वरेण वचनात प्रणयनादाम्नायस्य वेदस्य प्रामाण्य तथाहि वेदास्तावत् पौरुषेया वाक्यत्वादितिसाधित नचास्मदादयस्तेषा सदर्थाख्यार्थकर्त्तारा कर्त्तार सम्भाव्यन्ते अतीन्द्रियार्थत्वात नचातीन्द्रियार्थदर्शिनोऽस्मदादय किञ्चाप्तोक्ता वेदा महाजनपरिगृहीतत्वात यन्नाप्तोक्त न तन्महाजनपरिगृहीत महाजनपरिगृहीतञ्चेद तस्मादाप्तोक्तम स्वतन्त्रपुरुषप्रणीतत्वञ्चाप्तोक्तत्वम महाजनप

declared, that is promulgated, by Him, the divine being I
is proved that the Vedas have a personal author, inasmu
they are an enouncement. Nor can beings like us be the enun-
tors of these, appropriated to a thousand branches Moreov
their objects transcend the senses, and beings of our nature ca
not behold objects that transcend the senses The Vedas, aga
are rightly affirmed, inasmuch as they are received by the high
authorities That which is not rightly affirmed is not received b
the highest authorities, but these being received by such, a
rightly affirmed To be rightly affirmed is to be promulgated by a
independent personal author, and to be received by the highest a
thorities is to be an object in course of performance by persons attach
ed to all the systems It has been stated that non existence o
result sometimes accrues from the disparity of the action the agent
and the means If it be denied that this is so, the agent not being
remembered, we refuse such denial it having been already
proved that the agent is remembered The promulgation thereof
by him is proved inasmuch as it could be promulgated only by an
intelligent personal author while such independent power to pro
mulgate the Vedas in their thousand branches, is, as has been
said impossible for beings of our nature Inasmuch, moreover, as
certitude has excellence for its condition the certitude of the Veda
must have excellence for its condition and the excellence must in
this case be pronounced to be the enunciator s right knowledge of
the matter of the enouncement The enunciator of the Veda
must be one who has an intuition of elysium requitative efficacy,
and the like, and there is none such but God alone U

रिगृहीतत्वञ्च सर्वदर्शनान्तर्गतपुरुषानुष्ठीयमानार्थत्वम् क्वचित् फलाभाव कर्मक
र्तृसाधनवैगुण्यादित्युक्तम कर्तृस्मरणाभावाचैवमिति चेन्न कर्तृस्मरणस्य पूर्वमेव साधित
त्वात् तत्प्रणीतत्वञ्च स्वतन्त्रपुरुषप्रणीतत्वादेव सिद्धम न त्वस्मदादीनां सहस्रशाख
वेदप्रणयने स्वातन्त्र्यं सम्भवतीत्युक्तत्वात् । किञ्च प्रमाया गुणजन्यत्वेन वैदिकप्रमाया अपि
गुणजन्यत्वमावश्यक तत्र च गुणा वक्तृयथार्थवाक्यार्थज्ञानमेव वाच्यस्तथाच तादृश एव
वदे वक्ता च स्वर्गापूर्वादिविषयकसाक्षात्कारवान् तादृशश्च नेश्वरादन्य इति सुष्ठु ॥

FINIS